

1953

LIBRARY
STATE NORMAL COLLEGE
YPSILANTI, MICH.

APRIL 1953

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

The Teacher's Scrapbook

Two Loves that Built Two Cities	Sister M. Melchior	237
Latin Workshop	Paul MacKendrick	241

The Amazing Modernity of Euripides	Herbert Edward Mierow	247
------------------------------------	-----------------------	-----

The Classical Attack on the French Revolution	Morton J. Frisch	253
---	------------------	-----

Homer's Savage Fish	Frederick M. Combellack	257
---------------------	-------------------------	-----

Notes

A Note on Horace "Odes" 1.4	William Sylvester	262
Inaugural Lectures on the Classics	Eva Matthews Sanford	263

Notices		270
---------	--	-----

Book Reviews

<i>Athenaion Politeia</i> (Stecchini)	Alfred P. Dorjahn	271
Roman Anniversary Issues (Grant)	A. E. Raubitschek	271
Classics in Translation (MacKendrick-Howe)	Alfred P. Dorjahn	272
The Greeks and the Irrational (Dodds)	James A. Notopoulos	273
The <i>Aeneid</i> of Virgil (tr. Lewis)	James K. Robinson	279

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor-in-Chief and Business Manager: CLYDE MURLEY, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

Assistant Editor, Book Reviews: GRUNDY STEINER, Northwestern University.

Advertising Manager, D. HERBERT ABEL, Loyola University, 820 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago.

For Secondary Schools, GRACE L. BEEDE, University of South Dakota.

"Notes": OSCAR E. NYBAKKEN, State University of Iowa.

"Classical Articles in Non-Classical Periodicals": EDWARD L. BASSETT, University of Chicago.

WILLIAM C. GRUMMEL, University of Washington

"We See by the Papers": JOHN F. LATIMER, 706 20th St., N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

For the Atlantic States: FRANKLIN B. KRAUSS, Pennsylvania State College,

For New England: JAMES A. NOTOPOULOS, Trinity College.

For the Pacific States: W. M. GREEN, University of California.

Associate Editors: W. M. GREEN, University of California; GEORGE E. LANE, Thayer Academy, Braintree, Mass.; FRANKLIN H. POTTER, State University of Iowa; F. STUART CRAWFORD, Boston University; EUGENE MILLER, University of Pittsburgh.

CORRESPONDENCE

Address all general editorial correspondence, MSS etc. to CLYDE MURLEY, 629 Noyes St., Evans-

ton 16, Ill.; departmental materials to the proper editors listed above; MSS from the Atlantic, New England, and Pacific States to the regional editors above; subscriptions and details of circulation to Sec'y-Treas. JOHN N. HOUGH, 8E Hellems Hall, University of Colorado, Boulder; advertising and reprints to Mr. Abel.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

The general subscription price is \$3.75 (USA), \$4.00 (foreign). Single copies 60c (USA), 65c (foreign); subscriptions for less than a year at the single copy rate. Teachers and other interested individuals may subscribe through one of the regional associations below, annual membership-subscription rate, \$3.75. Members may subscribe also to the CLASSICAL OUTLOOK and CLASSICAL WEEKLY; for rates consult the regional secretary-treasurer. Members of CAMWS and CAAS have the option of receiving either the CLASSICAL JOURNAL or CLASSICAL WEEKLY (published by CAAS).

MEMBERSHIPS

Address the Secretary-Treasurer of the appropriate regional association. CAMWS, JOHN N. HOUGH, 8E Hellems Hall, University of Colorado, Boulder. CANE, F. STUART CRAWFORD, 7E Commonwealth Ave., Boston 15. CAAS, EUGENE MILLER, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh 12. CAPS (Northern), MISS WINIFRED E. WETTER, Seattle Pacific College, Seattle 99. (Central), E. Y. LINDSAY, Grant Union H. S., Del Mar Heights, Calif. (Southern), MRS. JANE M. B. FIELD, 10474 1/2 Eastbourne Ave., Los Angeles 24.

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL is published by the *Classical Association of the Middle West and South, Inc.*, with the cooperation of the *Classical Association of New England*, the *Classical Association of the Pacific States*, and the *Classical Association of the Atlantic States*. Published monthly except June, July, August and September. Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Evanston, Ill. with an additional entry at Boulder, Colorado. Entered under act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on October 19, 1952.

Printed by the Multicopy Corporation, Evanston, Illinois, U. S. A.

Copies	1-4pp.	5-8pp.		9-12pp.	13-16pp.	Covers
25	4.00	5.50	Price	6.00	7.50	5.00
50	4.25	6.00	List	6.80	8.40	5.50
75	4.50	6.50	For	7.60	9.30	6.00
100	4.75	7.00	Reprints	8.40	10.20	6.50
Add'l 100	1.00	2.00		3.20	3.60	2.00

Reprints are made up in excerpt form without covers, unless otherwise ordered. For reprints requiring extra composition, changes in text, special cover setup, and alterations, an extra charge will be made.

the proper
matic, Ne
ional el
circula
Hellen
advertising

(USA).
SA), 66
a year
and other
rough the
ual mem
bers may
look and
t the re
CAMWS
ing either
WEEKLY

the appo
JOHN R.
Colorado
ford, 75
S, Eucaly
sburgh 13
E. WETER
(Central)
Del Par
HE M. B.
angeles 24

iddle West
land, the
Atlantic
s second
ter, Colo
al rate of
19, 1952

s

for reprint
an estim



THE TEACHER'S SCRAPBOOK

Two Loves That Built Two Cities

ARCHEOLOGISTS TELL US that once there was a land bridge from the coast of Northern Africa to Sicily and the toe of Italy. Perhaps it is the bond of union, forgotten through the ages, which made these shores ever eager to welcome travelers from either land. But once in history the ties of union were rudely severed and *Delenda est Carthago* sounded in the Roman Forum. Virgil in the *Aeneid* lays a romantic basis for this enmity between Carthage and Rome: the hero founder of the Roman nation had left behind in Carthage the outraged Queen Dido when he followed the bidding of the gods and proceeded with his destined journey to Italy. The curse of enmity, which Dido laid upon the Romans and her descendants as she mounted the steps of her funeral pyre, was fulfilled in the wars which Rome waged with Carthage during the third and second centuries before the Christian era.

The episode of Aeneas and Dido as it is portrayed in Book Four of Virgil's *Aeneid* is one of the immortal stories of western literature. In an equally famous book, the *Confessions* of Saint Augustine, there is an interesting parallel to be drawn from the account which the Saint gives of his own departure from Carthage when he set out to teach in Rome. Fifteen centuries separated the pious Aeneas from Saint Augustine. But the schoolboy Augustine, when he

studied literature at Madaura, had formed an acquaintance with the famous hero of the Trojan race, for he "had been forced to memorize the wanderings of Aeneas....while forgetting my own wanderings," he says, "and to weep for the death of Dido who killed herself for love." (1. 13. 30)¹ A year of idleness followed Augustine's early studies. Then at the age of sixteen he went to Carthage to continue his schooling. Here he could live again the treasured lines of Virgil's epic and witness dramatic presentations of Dido's tragedy. Upon completion of his studies he returned to Tagaste and began teaching rhetoric to his fellow-townsmen.

URBS ANTIQUA FUT: For Aeneas as for Augustine, Carthage was not a native city. Hector, whom he saw in a vision during Troy's last night, gave him his country's deities and predicted a lengthy journey with these "companions of destiny," the gods for whom he was to found a city. (2. 293-5) Augustine, leaving his native Tagaste a second time, went, all unknowing, in search of the City of God, the temple not built with hands, whose foundations, he tells us, had been laid already in the breast of his mother while he and his father still followed crooked ways. (2. 3. 6) Aeneas carried the gods of Troy to Italy, while it was the true God who brought Augustine first to Rome,

then to the font of baptism in Milan, and later to the tombs of Peter and Paul, twin founders of an eternal Rome.²

NON SPONTE: Mercury, the messenger god of Jupiter, appeared abruptly to Aeneas in Carthage as he lingered there enamored of Dido, laying the foundations of the citadel, constructing a fair city. Only the mandate from the king of heaven stirred Aeneas to go on to Italy: "I follow Italy not because I want to." (361)³ Augustine found his way to the capital of the western world when friends persuaded him that in Rome his talents would be better appreciated, his pupils more docile, and his remuneration greater. In these influences Augustine later realized that God's ready mercy had been at work, accomplishing His most secret and profound purposes. He says, "I did not wish to go to Rome." (5. 8. 14)⁴ His words echo those of Aeneas when he tried to explain his departure to Dido. Augustine says to God: "But You, O my Hope and my Portion in the land of the living, forced me to change countries for my soul's salvation: You pricked me with such goads at Carthage as drove me out of it, and You set before me certain attractions by which I might be drawn to Rome." (*Ibid.*)

ITALIAM SEQUOR: To go to Italy and to Rome meant for Aeneas and for Augustine the severing of ties with those they loved. Aeneas must say farewell to Dido; Augustine must leave his mother Monica in Africa.⁵ In each instance the tender depths of human love were stirred, a woman's wish was set aside, and a greater design of heaven was fulfilled. Both men planned their departure in secrecy. At the message from Jupiter,

Appalled, amazed, Aeneas
Is stricken dumb; his hair stands up in

terror,
His voice sticks in his throat. He is
more than eager
To flee that pleasant land, awed by
the warning
Of the divine command. But how to do
it?
How get around that passionate queen?
What opening
Try first? (278-84)

At length he decides to have the
leaders of his band prepare

The fleet for voyage, meanwhile saying
nothing
About the new activity.

Augustine's plans, too, were hidden from his mother. He lied to her; he says "I deceived her with the pretence that I had a friend whom I did not want to leave until he had sailed off with a fair wind." (5. 8. 15) Using this excuse he explained his trip to the harbor and his delay there while he awaited evening and a wind to carry his ship away.

QUIS FALLIT AMANTEM? Dido became suspicious of her lover's intentions and soon realized his plan of departure.

Who can deceive a woman in love? The
queen
Anticipates each move, is fearful even
While everything is safe, foresees this
cunning. (296-8)

The ardent lover of Aeneas feared for his bodily safety; Monica feared for Augustine's soul. Yet God was punishing his mother's too earthly affection for her son, he tells us, with the scourge of grief, "For she loved to have me with her, as is the way of mothers, but far more than most mothers; and she did not realize what joys You would bring her from my going away." (5. 8. 15) Aeneas faced the queen in all her desperation as she flung at him her angry cries:

And so, betrayer,

You hoped to hide your wickedness, go
sneaking
Out of my land without a word? (305-6)

She recalled their pledge of love; she pointed out the difficulties of a journey in the wintry season; she begged him by all that she held sacred to change his mind; she tried to rouse pity for her loneliness and the danger she faced from her brother and from Iarbas. (307-29) Monica, too, tried to hold Augustine back. She followed him down to the sea; she clung to him, begging him to return with her or, at least, to take her with him. (5. 8. 15)

RUMPE MORAS: It was night when Aeneas was again visited by Mercury in a dream. He was chided for delaying his sailing since all was in readiness for his departure. The interim might provide an opportunity for Dido to set fire to the fleet. As he vanished into the night, Mercury's parting words were ominous: "A shifty, fickle object is woman, always." (569-70) The second warning by the celestial messenger brought an end to Aeneas' stay in Africa. Before cutting the cables which bound his ships to shore he breathed a prayer:

O holy one, we follow

Whoever you are, we are happy in obeying.

Be with us, be propitious; let the stars

Be right in heaven! (575-9)

Not Augustine, but Monica prayed as her son left Carthage. Under pretence that he must await a friend's departure he had persuaded her to go to an oratory of St. Cyprian there near the harbor. "That night I stole away without her; she remained praying and weeping.... The wind blew and filled our sails and the shore dropped from sight." (5. 8. 15)

REGINA E SPECULIS: Dawn rose over the harbor of Carthage and from her watchtower Dido saw the fleet under sail, the harbor empty. Her anguish was extreme. Rending her hair, she uttered dreadful curses which were to be fulfilled in Aeneas' descendants and in her own. Monica voiced no imprecations. She knew only how to pray and weep as she complied with Augustine's wishes and waited in the little oratory. She turned to God and begged Him not to let her son sail, but He did not grant her wish. In the morning, she, like Dido, saw that the ship had gone, and in her great sorrow she filled the ears of God with moaning and complaints. When she had poured out all her accusation at the cruel deception which Augustine had worked, she turned to God and prayed for him. Aeneas and Augustine each in turn looked for the last time at the land they loved. Virgil says of Aeneas:

His gaze went back

To the walls of Carthage, glowing in the flame

Of Dido's funeral pyre. What cause had kindled

So high a blaze, they did not know, but anguish

When love is wounded deep, and the way of a woman,

With frenzy in her heart, they knew too well,

And dwelt on with foreboding. (5. 3-7)

Monica must have told Augustine in later years how frantic with grief she was when for him "the shore dropped from sight." She did not know what joy lay in store for her from his going away. In great distress, at last "she went home and I to Rome." (5. 8. 15)

SEQUAR: Although separated from their loved ones, both women desired still to be with them and to further influence them. Dido prophesied that she

would follow Aeneas:

Oh, I will follow
In blackest fire, and when cold death
has taken
Spirit from body, I will be there to haunt
you (384 f.)

But Monica continued her prayers. They were instrumental, Augustine confesses, in saving him from death when he was grievously ill during his first days in Rome. "My mother was far away and knew nothing of my illness, but she prayed on for me. You (God) who art present everywhere heard her where she was and had compassion on me where I was, so that I recovered the health of my body, though still far from health in my sacrilegious heart." (5. 9. 16)

PETE REGNA PER UNDAS: Dido's last desire had been to tear Aeneas' body limb from limb and scatter it in the waters. Her wish was unfulfilled. As for Augustine, the waters which eventually closed over him were not the destroying waters of the Mediterranean Sea but the saving waters of baptism at the hands of Saint Ambrose. Speaking to God of this event, which has linked the names of the Bishop of Milan and the Bishop of Hippo in the early annals of the Church, Augustine says: "You have mercifully forgiven me, bringing me from the waters of that sea, filled as I was with execrable uncleanness, unto the water of your grace." (5. 8. 15) Monica's tears had ceased to flow, those tears by which she formerly watered the ground as she prayed for her son. She had herself crossed over to Italy and come to Milan. En route, the ship faced a storm reminiscent of that which shipwrecked the fleet of Aeneas on African shores centuries before. In Augustine's baptism Monica realized a new and closer union with her son, who had now become a

child of God. And as if to associate him forever with the great founder of the Roman race, the *pious* Aeneas, Augustine says of her as she lay dying, "When her illness was close to its end, meeting with expressions of endearment such services as I rendered, she called me a *dutiful* son." (9. 12. 30)

These two, the pagan queen and the Christian mother, have, by their love, achieved immortality. Virgil conferred enduring fame on Dido by depicting her despair and tragic suicide when she was parted from her lover. St. Augustine has presented to all succeeding ages a figure of Christian hope in his beautiful portraiture of Monica.

SISTER M. MELCHIOR

*Rosary College
River Forest, Illinois*

NOTES

¹*The Confessions of St. Augustine*, trans. by F. J. Sheed (New York, 1942); used throughout except as indicated in note 4.

²In *De Beata Vita* 1.1-5, Augustine uses an extended simile of a stormy sea voyage to describe his difficulty in reaching the port of philosophy. It is quite probable that the daily reading of Virgil which he and his friends engaged in while they were at Cassiciacum, the scene of the *De Beata Vita*, made the imagery of a sea voyage particularly forceful at this time.

³*The Aeneid of Virgil, A Verse Translation* by R. Humphries (New York, 1951); used throughout this paper. All references but two are to *Aen.* 4.

⁴*Non ideo Romam pergere volui.* This clause seems not to have been given its true significance in Sheed's translation, where he writes, "My reason for going to Rome was not the greater earnings and high dignity promised by the friends who urged me to go. . . ."

⁵Nowhere in the *Confessions* does Augustine describe his parting with his son and common-law wife. It is thought that they stayed behind when he went to Rome, and that they came to Milan later when Monica did so.

⁶*Italics mine.* Latin, *appellabat me pius.*

Latin Workshop

THE DECISION to embark upon a three-week summer Latin Workshop in Madison, succeeding after a long interval the Wisconsin Latin Laboratory of many years ago, was made by a group of Wisconsin teachers at the annual banquet of the CAMWS in Memphis in 1951. There was never of course any intention to supersede other similar institutes: the fine one of many years standing, conducted by Professor Wagener at William and Mary, drew upon a quite different geographical area; Michigan's specializes in linguistics; Minnesota's lasts only a week; and with Iowa we undertook an informal agreement to alternate our programs. In any case we felt that no single workshop, including ours, presents a direct pipeline to the Absolute; a teacher would profit, we thought, from attending more than one.

The stated aim was to help teachers, by giving them the opportunity to work eat, and live together, toward solving some of their teaching problems; to open to them the wealth and richness of classical civilization; to make them aware of the latest results of scholarship in the field; and to suggest how they might apply all this to enrich and enliven their teaching. Perhaps the most important aim of all was to give Latin teachers, often isolated in communities where few have similar interests, the chance to discuss their work with like-minded persons from a wide variety of backgrounds.

To achieve these ends, it was of the first importance to set up a well-

balanced faculty. We were fortunate enough to obtain the services of a high-school Latin teacher of many years' successful experience, Miss Esther Weightman of Wisconsin High School, Madison; we were lucky, too in the presence of a beloved, wise and energetic professor with an infectious sense of humor, a man who knows the fields both of classics and of education, Professor W. L. Carr of the University of Kentucky. To these two, in the writer's opinion, as well as to the forty dedicated Latin teachers who participated, the Wisconsin Workshop owes whatever success it achieved. The present writer undertook to present the latest results of scholarship in Roman literature and history, while Professor Agard offered in a series of evening lectures the syntheses of the present meaning of classical civilization for which his reputation is nationwide.

THE CHOICE OF SUBJECT-MATTER for the workshop was not arrived at by imposition from above. In November, 1951 questionnaires were circulated to Wisconsin high school teachers, inquiring what they would like to have offered. As a result, the following program was arrived at:

(1) A two-hour daily laboratory course in *methods*, in which the subjects of discussion and report were visual aids, coins, new reference materials (see Appendix); methods in reading, grammar, and vocabulary; extra-curricular activities, and tests.

(2) A lecture course in *Roman Life*,

with topics including the Roman revolution, the Roman constitution, Roman art and architecture (illustrated), philosophy and religion, slavery and the plebs, the Roman aristocracy, ancient science, and the Roman's day.

(3) A course on *Caesar in Gaul*, in which the whole of the *Gallic Wars* was read, as the basis for lectures on Gaul before the Romans, Caesar's legions and legates, Roman roads and camps, Caesar's "clemency," the conference at Luca, the Roman navy, Roman Britain, Caesar and the Ciceros, Alesia, and Caesar's impact upon history.

(4) A series of five lectures on *classical civilization*. The subjects were "Three-Dimensional Classics," "Classical Sculpture," "The Mythological Tradition in Sculpture," "Democracy in the Ancient World," "Athens, Rome, and the United States."

In all these courses the main aim was to reconcile the apparently conflicting and sometimes mutually misunderstood points of view of the high-school Latin teacher and the research scholar. There was generous and hearty agreement that this goal was reached. The usual metaphor, wherein the high-school teacher is the tactical fighter in the front lines, while the professor in the rear echelon works out the high-level strategy, seemed to us badly chosen. In the first place, whom are we fighting? Our students? Only at the fag-end of a difficult winter term would any but the most discouraged and defeatist teacher admit it. The public? Surely what it needs is to be enlightened, not quarreled with. In the second place, there is, or ought to be, no relation of superiority and inferiority between high-school and college teachers. They work with different age-groups but toward the same goal: technical competence, comprehension,

relation of the then with the now, the achieving of that middle ground between understanding the future of our tradition and being enslaved to its past. Thirdly, the liaison between high-school and university is unfortunately not as close as that between front line and rear echelon. But the separate worlds which high-school and college teachers tend to inhabit can be connected by such links as a Latin Workshop, and there seems to be general agreement that to make the connection is to all parties concerned a satisfying and even exhilarating experience. In it the professor learns of the common sense and intelligence with which the high school teacher, competing successfully with the meretricious attractions of comic books, commercial radio, and television, faces and solves the problems of relating classical culture to the experience of a generation to which that culture is at the outset almost meaningless. On the other hand the teacher discovers that the professor's research can contribute bountifully to the resources upon which she can draw to enrich and enliven her teaching.

THERE IS NORMALLY, for reasons which it would be laborious and probably thankless to assess, a twenty-year time-lag between the publication of *research* and the appearance of the results in *textbooks*. As the publication of new and up-to-date Latin textbooks becomes less and less a commercially feasible undertaking, the function of the workshop in reducing the gap will become more and more important. Since the matter falls within the field of such competence as the present writer possesses, he may be forgiven perhaps for enlarging on it briefly with an example.

The picture of Caesar which most of

us learned to recognize in school and college rested upon the preconception that everything Roman was admirable, and upon the notion of Mommsen that Caesar as Superman was both necessary and praiseworthy. A newer view, resulting from the world's experience of totalitarianism and from the intricate research of Ronald Syme and Lily Ross Taylor—to mention only writers in English—starts from the assumption that that Roman civilization is as much of a warning as an example. This view presents Caesar as a leader of one of two equally violent factions contesting for the possession of the Roman body politic, a man brilliant but unscrupulous, using the spoils of Gaul to finance a drive to power forced upon him by the fears and short-sighted jealousy of the Roman ruling class, which could not brook a rival and refused to tolerate a superior. The old uncritical acceptance of the superiority of all things Roman involved us in the contradiction of regarding Caesar the Superman and Brutus the tyrant-slayer as equally admirable; in the new view, Brutus is a well-meaning republican who by violent means snuffed out an innovator who for whatever motives was sketching out a liberal program which would have brought peace to Italy and the provinces, security for the Empire. Read in this light, the *Gallic* and especially the *Civil Wars* become more than a fine adventure story—though they will always be that—; they appear as fascinating documents of power-politics which illuminate for even the youngest readers the difficult problems of our own troubled time.

And while this illumination is being thrown on the political meaning of Caesar and his age, recent excavations in France, carried out by the Vichy govern-

ment in search of a link between modern and ancient totalitarianism, cast light on the civilization of Gaul, on the ambitious engineering of Caesar's camps, and on the history of places like Alesia before, during, and after the Roman domination.

What of the future? We hope to offer the Latin Workshop again in 1954. It will be preceded as before by a questionnaire, but we hope for spontaneous suggestions now from teachers. At the moment, the following seem promising areas for investigation:

THE FIRST and most controversial is the *linguistic method* of teaching elementary Latin. Most of us were brought up to understand and admire the beautiful structure of Latin accidence and syntax, presented to us in a manner based upon at least three assumptions: (1) that Latin resembles English more than it differs from it; (2) that everyone will spend at least ten years learning the language; (3) that everyone is familiar with Aristotle's logic, from which the traditional syntax is derived. Fairmindedness compels us to admit that these three assumptions are false. The theoretical work of Dr. Waldo Sweet at Michigan, and his practical work at the William Penn Charter School, plus the interpretation by Dr. Myra Uhlfelder of Iowa State in a recent *Classical Weekly*, compel our attention. It is probably impossible in a workshop lasting only three weeks to do more than sketch superficially the analytical method; to emphasize the difference between a language like English which achieves meaning by word order and one like Latin which does so by inflection ("signals"); to consider the horizontal method of learning paradigms, wherein all like signals are learned at

once, across the board. We have no intention of forcing this method upon the unwilling, but it is one that has been tried and found to work, so that sheer intellectual curiosity, if nothing else, should prompt us to inquire into it and to take from it what we find of value. Expressions of opinion on this issue from teachers are eagerly sought and will be much appreciated.

A SECOND field where much good work can be done is *mythology*. The method of teaching it based upon Gayley or other secondary sources is stultifying and dull: the great repository of myth is Ovid, and Ovid can be read by properly trained students at the end of their second year. Myth at first hand from the *Metamorphoses* should provide both more enjoyment and more instruction than myths learned by the hand-book method.

A THIRD area where workshops can help is in presenting the latest results of scholarship in *Cicero and Vergil*. A survey planned by the *Classical Weekly* will bring within the next year or so new bibliographies to the attention of teachers. Meanwhile of Cicero it may be said that there is new background material for the standard orations, and that excellent and fascinating textbooks—which almost teach themselves—are available (see Appendix) for orations less often read like the *Verrines* and the *pro Cluentio*, for select letters, and even for the *De Divinatione*. Further, the work of Tenney Frank and Matthias Gelzer (from fourteen to twenty year old now but not widely enough known) presents Cicero not as a *doctrinaire* reactionary nor a vacillating time-server but as a consistent middle of the road conservative whose greatest

political sin was the very one of which he accuses Cato the Younger, the unrealistic attempt to set up Plato's *Republic* in the midst of the scum of Romulus. As for Vergil, his relation to the national program of the Augustan principate was re-examined in 1939 by Syme, with results important to every Latin teacher, and two brilliant new verse translations of the *Aeneid* by poets, Rolfe Humphries in America and C. Day-Lewis in England, make Vergil more meaningful to modern man, and boy, and girl.

SPACE DOES not permit analysis of the possibilities of a new approach to the *history of Latin literature* which shall take into account the results of new or forthcoming publication: on the comic poets, Lucretius, Tacitus, and Petronius, to take only a few examples. But this paper will make clear that the business of participating in Latin workshops is exciting and important; that it is one which brings about a meeting of minds between school and college teachers, never more necessary than now; and that it is one in which the keynote is not competition but co-operation, to the end that we may jointly bring to a new generation a knowledge of the relevance to our time of the culture to the understanding of which, both as warning and as example, so many of us have devoted the greater part of our lives.

PAUL MACKENDRICK

University of Wisconsin

APPENDIX

University of Wisconsin
Latin Workshop

Recommended Books on Roman Civilization

I. Booksellers: B. H. Blackwell
48-51 Broad Street
Oxford, England

L'Erma di Bretschneider
Via Cassiodoro 19
Rome, Italy

II. *Exchange*

1 pound = \$2.80
350 francs = \$1.00
625 lire = \$1.00

III. *Bibliography* J. A. Nairn, *Classical Hand List* Blackwell, 1939 (and later editions)

IV. *Journals* *Greece and Rome* (English)
Antiquity (English; archaeological)
Archaeology (American)
The Phoenix (Canadian; U. of Toronto)

V. *Reference Books*

Oxford Classical Dictionary, Oxford 1949. This is now the standard reference work in English. Authoritative articles by experts; bibliography. Supersedes all others.

Sir Paul Harvey *Oxford Companion to Classical Literature*, Oxford, 1937. Smaller, less scholarly and formidable. The editor also had a hand in *OCD*.

H. Stuart Jones *Companion to Roman History*, Oxford, 1912. Miscellaneous articles on Roman roads, the Army and Navy, Roman art and architecture, etc.

Sir J. E. Sandys *Companion to Latin Studies*³, Cambridge, 1921.

J. Wight Duff, *History of Latin Literature*, Vol. I *To the Close of the Golden Age*, London, 1927; vol. II, *The Silver Age*, London 1930. The most readable of the literary histories, written by a man who loves his subject. Sensitive criticism, good and often amusing translations. Other histories by H. J. Rose (2nd ed. London, 1949) and Moses Hadas (New York, 1952) are more factual.

Cyril Bailey and others, *The Legacy of Rome*, Oxford, 1923. Essays by humanists on our debt to Rome in religion, law, language, literature, government, philosophy, science, architecture, art, building, engineering and agriculture.

VI. *Histories of Rome*

M. Cary *History of Rome* London 1935. Most complete 1 volume coverage.

A. W. Gomme and S. N. Miller *The Roman Republic and The Roman Empire* in E. Eyre, *European Civilization*, Oxford, 1935. Authoritative, readable, the best in English.

R. Syme *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford, 1939. The most important book in English of this century on the last century of the Republic. Studies names and families, rule by clique. Hard on Augustus. Takes, and repays, more than one reading.

F. B. Marsh *History of Rome 146-31 B.C.* London 1935. From the destruction of Corinth and Carthage to the Battle of Actium. Up-to-date, readable, unorthodox.

VII. *Textbooks*

H. Grose Hodge *Murder at Larinum* Cambridge 1935

Verres in Sicily Cambridge, no date

R. D. Wormald, G. M. Lyne, *Rogues Gallery*, Cambridge, 1939

H. E. Butler *The Catilinarian Conspiracy* in the Clarendon Press Series, partly in translation.

Colby, J. K. *Reading Latin*, published by the College Entrance Examination Board (write to author for copies at Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.) Contains graded sentences on various points of syntax, sight translation with a method, and word lists.

VIII. *Picture books*

L. Goldscheider, *Roman Portraits*, London, 1945

Etruscan Sculpture, London, 1941

Edith Hamilton and others, *Everyday Life in Ancient Times*, reprinted from National Geographic Magazine, 1951.

F. H. Cowell, *Cicero and the Roman Republic*, London, 1948. Especially good charts on the organization of the Roman constitution.

M. I. Rostoftzeff *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* English edition, London, 1926, Italian edition Florence 1933. All this author's publications are full of excellent pictures with complete explanatory text.

H. Bittner, E. Nash, *Rome*, Chicago 1950

Mostra Augustea della Romanità, Rome 1938. The guide book of Mussolini's exhibition. Best existing pictures of Roman life.

Ferrabino, Aldo, *Nuova Storia di Roma*, 3 vols. Rome 1942-8. Best pictures of Roman history from the beginning through Trojan. Literally crammed with photographs; no knowledge of Italian required. 6000 lire.

Attraverso L' Italia. Series of picture books published at Milan by CIT, the Italian tourist agency. About 800 lire per volume. Covers Italy province by province.

Ministero della pubblica istruzione, Rome: *Guide to Pompeii, Ostia, Hadrian's villa*, the various museums, etc. Usually issued also in English translation. About 250 lire each. Order from Libreria dello Stato, Rome.

G. Lugli, I. Gismondi, *Forma Urbis Romae*, Rome, 1949. The most up-to-date map. 1500 lire, unmounted.

The Roman Letter, R. Donnelley, Chicago, 1952. A give-away book by the printers of *Life* and the *Encyclopedia Britannica* on epigraphy and palaeography.

IX. Interpretations

Barrow, R. H., *The Romans*. Penguin, London, 1949. Conservative

Rand, E. K. *The Building of Eternal Rome*, Cambridge, Mass., 1943.

Greene, W. C., *The Achievement of Rome*, Cambridge, Mass. 1933

Waddy, L. H., *Pax Romana and World Peace*, New York, 1950. Written for English schoolboys.

Hight, Gilbert *The Classical Tradition*, N. Y. 1949. The classics in later literature. Very readable, very full bibliographies.

Clark, Eleanor *Rome and a Villa* N.Y. 1952. Sensitive account of the interlocking of ancient medieval and modern Rome by a distinguished modern novelist. The villa is Hadrian's.

H. Grose-Hodge, *Roman Panorama*, Cambridge, 1944. Text and pictures.

R. W. Moore *The Roman Constitution*, English Universities Press, 1946. Written for English schoolboys.

J. Carcopino *Roman Private Life*, New Haven, 1941. Supersedes H. W. Johnston.

C. W. Ceram *Gods, Graves and Scholars*, N.Y. 1951. A best-seller on the romance of archaeology.

George Dennis *Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria*, 2 vols. Everyman Library, reprint of 3rd ed. London, 1878. In spite of the lugubrious title, this is still the best book on the Etruscans, written in the spacious style of the mid-nineteenth century. A real collector's item.

X. *Translations*. Those in the Loeb Classical Library, Latin on one side of the page, English on the other, are \$2.70 each with professional discount from the publishers, the Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. If ordered from England, they are 15/- (\$2.10) postage.

XI. Novels. Most are bad. A few with some merit beyond their subject are:

Robert Graves *I Claudius* and *Claudius the God*, N.Y. and London, 1934-35.

Thornton Wilder *The Ides of March* N.Y. 1948

The Woman of Andros

Arthur Koestler, *The Gladiators*

Phyllis Bentley, *Freedom Farewell*

Rudyard Kipling *Puck o' Pook's Hill*

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

Volume 48 Number 6

MARCH 1953

The Amazing Modernity of Euripides

IN VIEW of the present interest aroused by Euripides' *Medea*, some remarks on the amazing modernity of this great playwright of ancient Greece may be in order, especially since its production has stimulated such peculiar comments. Robinson Jeffers, in the New York Times Magazine of January 18th, 1948, said: "Lately I had occasion to read more attentively the 'Medea' of Euripides, and considering the reverence that cultivated people feel toward Greek tragedy I was a little shocked by what I read. Tragedy has been regarded, ever since Aristotle, as a moral agent, a purifier of the mind and emotions. But the story of 'Medea' is about a criminal adventurer and his gun-moll." On the other hand, Brooks Atkinson, in the New York Times of October 26th, 1947, said the exact opposite, intimating that the *Medea* needs a climax of inhuman horror. To the ordinary person it would seem that they couldn't both be right. But these things are far from simple.

Now, as to Aristotle, we must remember that he wrote after the time of the Greek tragic poets, and that his judgments are derived from what he found in the tragedies. Like Mr. Jeffers, he is merely voicing his opinion on the plays; he objects to the use of the *deus ex machina* at the end of the *Medea*. I may add that the Greek audience, or at least the judges of the contest in which the *Medea* appeared, awarded it the third

and last place. No doubt they were horrified at the presentation of such a foreign barbarian as Medea on the Athenian stage. I say these things merely to indicate that cultivated people at times temper their reverence for tragedy by examining it critically.

But there is another side to this. The curtain is not the picture! I would suggest that Mr. Jeffers confuses *story* with the dramatic treatment of the story. He does go on to say that the poetry is the thing. But in this case, why suggest that the *story* is not moral and that it is ferocious? Everyone knows that this is true. Mr. Jeffers speaks of the *conventional pious sentiments of the Chorus* as being more than balanced by the bad temper or folly of the principal characters. But this, too, needs explanation. The chorus has a double role in Greek tragedy. It speaks as a person, if we may put it thus, and it sings choral odes. The *conventional pious sentiments* referred to are certainly not of great importance, though at times the Chorus does help the audience to understand what is being enacted on the stage by repeating what has been said by the actors or by making generalizations.

The choral odes are a different matter. Scholars have pointed out the fact that Aeschylus, in his choral odes in particular, had his eye on immortality; let us say with Mr. Jeffers, on the future.

In an article in *The Catholic World* for January, 1948, it is said that the awfulness of the children's murder in the *Medea* is in some degree made endurable by the universalizing influence of the chorus. From the horror of the actual event we are led by the chorus to reflection on another old story, how Ino killed her children. And this possibly produces something like the tragic catharsis which is just now in such bad odor.

What I wish to say as plainly as I can is this. The quality which is admirable in Greek tragedy, and perhaps in Greek literature in general, is its universality. The mere knowledge that suffering is universal, that it is shared by the whole human race, does have a potency which an isolated instance of horror and suffering does not have. Aesthetic beauty, to be sure, not morality—at least in the vulgar sense—is the mark of great literature. We may however add that in Aeschylus we have a deeply religious morality. But let us note the interest aroused by Euripides. What, we may ask, are the qualities which make for continuing attention to the work of a playwright?

The ancient Greeks drew their stories from mythology. And this, no doubt, creates a barrier between them and a modern audience. As a matter of fact, it created a barrier between Euripides and his own audience. The audience of his day did not have a large acquaintance with mythology. This constitutes one reason for the peculiar Euripidean prologue which gives a resume of the mythical story involved in the play.

To be sure, we should notice that Shakespeare often utilizes stories at least as foolish and unreasonable as the Greek myths and that he handles his plots with far less effectiveness than

the Greeks. One is inclined to believe that Euripides, properly presented on the modern stage, would be far easier of comprehension than Shakespeare is, for an audience of any sort. In fact, one of the most difficult things to understand is this: What is there good about Shakespeare? And this is not intended to be humorous! The loose structure of the Shakespearian play, the multiplicity of scenes are well known: the Romantic drama is always difficult to follow for this reason. Again, if Mr. Jeffers is shocked at the *Medea*, what must he think of the brutal blinding of Gloucester in *King Lear*? Perhaps he would refer us to Oedipus putting out his own eyes. But Sophocles' psychology is good. Here is a human being who, though unwittingly, has killed his own father and married his own mother, crimes so enormous that Oedipus blinds himself, as if to shut out from his vision the horrors he has looked upon.

The modern audience, generally speaking, without doubt prefers an original plot, invented by the dramatist. Consequently both Euripides and Shakespeare labor under similar difficulties, as far as modern presentation is concerned. What, then, is good about Shakespeare? Two things in the case of Shakespeare cannot fail to be realized. His best utterance has the elevation and the simplicity that mark the greatest poetry. "I did not think to shed a tear in all my miseries," says the great cardinal in Henry the Eighth. Who could equal this? Homer, certainly. Sophocles, perhaps. This restraint in expression, however, is a notable characteristic of the Greeks.

In this particular instance the restrained simplicity is heightened in effectiveness by the situation. Cardinal

Wolsey, as fortune fails him, is deeply moved by the loyalty of one man, Cromwell. And here we have the second great quality of Shakespeare. He makes his characters say what is appropriate to the situation. This is the mark of the great dramatist. It is one of the things of which Aristotle speaks in his analysis of tragedy. These are the qualities that make Shakespeare live today.

And what of Euripides? Let us examine his innovations in the drama. Euripides appeals to the modern world because he is the real creator of the modern drama. And this dictum is in no sense phantastic. Aeschylus is the architect of tragedy. But Euripides is the great Innovator.

This desire for the new is sometimes the mark of a decline. Today, in all forms of art, there is a desperate urge toward the original and the novel. This is at times trying on the plain man who is supposed to appreciate the results. Originality is not to be decried. But it must demonstrate its quality. In any case, an era which exalts the original may well pause for a moment to salute a playwright of ancient Greece who proved himself the Great Innovator in the drama.

Just as Xenophon and the march of The Ten Thousand pointed the way for the conquests of Alexander, so Euripides in many respects is the precursor of the Alexandrian Age. There has been an increasing interest in recent years in the Alexandrian or Hellenistic Age as well as in the Graeco-Roman Age, so-called, which succeeded it. And the reason is not far to seek, for to it the modern world is deeply indebted. In spite of the confusion of the era after Alexander's death and its vagaries, its spirit is comprehensible to us. It is modern, just because we have inherited

so much from it. With Alexander, the era of the Greek city-state, the *polis*, came to an end. And we have in its stead an age of the world-wide state in which the city-state sinks to the level of a municipality. Instead of the politics of the *polis*, we have cosmopolitanism, the extension of Greek culture to a larger world, and its modification as a result of foreign influences. It is the time when Stoicism could envisage—if it could not always practise its professions—the ideal of universal brotherhood. It is the age that we must understand if we would have a full comprehension of the beginnings of Christianity. It is the age characterized by a new, perhaps a sentimental, love of nature.

And now, Euripides. He has been called a realist, and this is true. He is representative of the age of the Sophists in which he lived. Like them, he is the eternal questioner. For him, the unexamined life was not worth living. Aeschylus might purify the old, immoral myths by the strength of his religious thought. Sophocles might be content to acquiesce in the orthodox religious feeling of the day. But on Euripides was the compulsion to examine the old stories of the gods and heroes, and to show their inconsistencies and their unethical character. As August Wilhelm Schlegel said in his lectures on dramatic art, Euripides had a way of going behind the scenes and discovering the gods in their night-shirts, a sort of examination bound to be trying on divine pretensions. Some modern writers enjoy poking fun at ancient Greek gods or heroic personages in a presumably sophisticated manner. This I do not enjoy. Nor would Euripides. He was very much in earnest.

In the *Ion*, the god Apollo appears as the real father of Ion, the eponymous

hero of the Ionian race. In the myth, that was the story. But Euripides had a way of presenting the tale in such fashion that the god's dignity suffered considerably.

Again, in the *Alcestis*, Euripides was not afraid to represent the hero, Hercules, as drinking and carousing in the home of his friend, Admetus, a sort of realism popular today.

The realism of Euripides even extended to the presentation on the stage of a Telephus or a Menelaus in rags. Realistic presentation of this sort was unheard of, and Aristophanes the comic poet honors it with great attention and boisterous humor, as he does the use of the *ekuklema*, a device which Euripides used to present interiors, by wheeling out upon the stage a platform. The crane, or machine, also comes in for its share of satire. By its use gods or heroes were introduced, flying through the air.

Perhaps we can realize more fully the extent of Euripides' realism by reference to the *Orestes*. Aeschylus, in his great trilogy in the grand style, had dealt with the murder of Agamemnon, at his return from Troy, by Clytaemnestra, with the revenge taken by the son, Orestes, and with the trial of Orestes for the murder of his mother. Aeschylus preserves the atmosphere of the heroic age. But Euripides, as usual, insists on viewing the traditional story in the light of common day. Orestes is represented as going on trial before the assembly at Argos, as if before a democratic court in Athens. Aeschylus presented Orestes as pursued by the Furies because of his matricide. In Euripides the Furies do not appear on the stage to the audience, but only to Orestes. In other words, it is Orestes' conscience, or his madness, that tor-

ments him. Helen of Troy, a figure ordinarily half divine, appears in this play as a vain and shallow woman, Menelaus as a hated Spartan, Orestes as mad, and his sister Electra as a woman embittered by the tragic events through which she has passed. To put the matter briefly, Euripides has here taken a myth and so transformed it that we have a play about middle-class people. Were it not for the good character-drawing, we might be tempted to condemn the play as a melodrama. It contains so many wild and fantastic situations. Yet Gilbert Norwood calls it a master-piece. A. E. Haigh points out its inferiorities. Thus do the doctors disagree!

Iphigenia at Aulis is another play that presents the old heroes as very ordinary people. It is a play so modern in character that it is extremely attractive and easy of comprehension at the present day. It begins with Agamemnon in his tent, writing a letter to his wife. The Greeks are encamped at Aulis, but cannot sail against Troy because of contrary winds. The seer, Calchas, has declared that they can never set sail unless Agamemnon's daughter, Iphigenia, is sacrificed to the goddess Artemis. So Agamemnon has asked his wife Clytaemnestra to send her to Aulis, using the pretence that she is to become the bride of Achilles. Now he is writing again, secretly, saying that Iphigenia should not be sent. Unfortunately this letter is intercepted by Menelaus in whose interest the expedition is being undertaken. There is a heated argument between the two. Menelaus is anxious to recover his wife, Helen. Agamemnon wishes to save his daughter.

But at this moment Clytaemnestra and Iphigenia arrive. By chance they meet Achilles whom Clytaemnestra greets as

her son-in-law to be. All this is news to Achilles. When he learns the truth, he offers to defend Iphigenia against the whole army, not indeed for her sake but because he has been insulted! They have used his name without consulting him. But now Iphigenia, gaining sudden courage, gloriously declares that she will die voluntarily for Greece. The ships must sail. At the last a messenger reports that she has been miraculously rescued by the goddess Artemis herself and that a deer has been substituted in her place.

Like the *Orestes*, this is a play depicting very ordinary people. The heroic character of the myth is completely dispensed with. Agamemnon wavers between his duty as a general and his love for his daughter. Menelaus thinks solely of himself. Achilles is amazing. The noble hero of the *Iliad*, destined to an early death, is here depicted as a selfish, vain brat, interested only in his own great renown. And at the end of the play we have the characteristic touch of Euripidean scepticism. Clytemnestra, when informed of her daughter's miraculous deliverance, replies that this is only a lie invented to comfort a heart that is broken.

The versatility of Euripides is astonishing. It was he who first set the fashion for the theatrical treatment of love, love in all its phases, "love, charming, gallant, passionate, illicit in young girl and in married woman, love chivalrous and adulterous," as Auguste Couat puts it. The conservative Aristophanes makes great capital of this and never ceases his caustic satire. Love is the principal subject of the New Comedy and of most of the writing of the Alexandrian Age and is holding its own at the present day. Aristophanes really must have liked Euripides. He

found in him such excellent material for satire.

One finds also in Euripides a vein of pure romance. Not only love, but what Raleigh calls the magic of distance. In *Iphigenia among the Taurians* we find the heroine as priestess of Artemis in the Crimea. Having been saved from death and transported to a barbaric land beyond the clashing rocks. From this wild spot, where human sacrifice is practiced, she is rescued by her brother Orestes.

The *Helen* of Euripides has Egypt as its locale. And, again, we have the rescuer, this time in the person of Menelaus.

The *Phaethon* is another romantic drama, almost a fairy tale, in which Phaethon goes to visit his father, the sun-god who apparently has his domicile next door. But this play was marred by the Euripidean touch of bitter realism.

Of all the romantic plays, however, the *Andromeda* seems to have aroused the greatest enthusiasm. The *Andromeda* is one of the "lost" plays, but like Schubert's unfinished symphony it still makes beautiful music. In the *Frogs* of Aristophanes, Dionysus himself, the patron saint of tragedy, is represented as on shipboard, reading the *Andromeda*. He is so entranced by it that he decides to descend to the nether regions to bring back Euripides. Euripides had died shortly before the production of the *Frogs*.

There is another amazing thing about the *Andromeda*, narrated by Lucian. It seems that the play was performed in Abdera in Thrace. And the whole town was afflicted by it with a tragic fever. Everyone went about declaiming the famous address to Eros. And this continued, says Lucian, until the coming of winter, when a severe frost cured them

of their madness.

The scene of the play is Aethiopia. Andromeda is chained to a rock on the sea-shore as a sacrifice to be devoured by a sea-monster which is ravaging the land. Phineus, whom Andromeda was to have married, is afraid to protect her. And her parents, too, have deserted her. The play opens with a beautiful apostrophe to Night, delivered by Andromeda. Then Perseus appears, flying through the air returning from his conquest of the Gorgon. As he approaches, he sees what he supposes to be a beautiful statue. But he perceives that the statue is alive. At first sight he falls in love with her. Cepheus, the father of Andromeda, agrees that Perseus shall marry the maiden if he can save her from the sea-beast. So out he goes to meet the monster, calling upon Eros to aid him. This was the speech that induced the amateur theatricals in Abdera! On his victorious return from the conflict, the happy country folk crowd around him, offering him milk and wine. This is a typical touch of rural nature which we find repeated, for example, in the Alexandrian poem by Callimachus called the *Hecale*.

These plays of adventure and rescue are the germ whence sprang that late Greek form of literature, the novel, or as it is usually termed, the Greek Romance. When it blossomed, the great age of Greek literature was past. Its interest lies rather in its first intima-

tions in Euripides and in its future development in times to come. In the typical Greek Romance, the hero and heroine undergo countless adventures and trials. But in the outcome, their fidelity has its eventual reward. Under the guidance and help of a deity they are rescued from all dangers. The patron deity often is one of the divinities more popular in the later times: *Tyche* or fate, and Eros, the god of love.

A brief review of Euripides' accomplishments may make a fitting conclusion. In literature he is the link between the Classical era and the new Cosmopolitan Age after Alexander. He is the representative in literature of the age of the Sophists, those teachers and philosophers who guided thought into new and sometimes questionable directions. Like them, he is a contradiction. He is the great realist and, at the same time, a master of romance. He is the inventor of tragi-comedy and the phantasy. He is the idol of the writers of New Comedy. He paves the way for the Greek Romances. We feel kinship with him because his is the spirit that descends to us from Athens and Alexandria through Rome.

These are the achievements of the brilliant, the sophisticated, the versatile Euripides. Age cannot wither him, nor custom stale his infinite variety.

HERBERT EDWARD MIEROW
Colorado Springs, Colorado

The Classical Attack on the French Revolution

EDMUND BURKE once remarked that "the legislators who framed the ancient republics knew that their business was too arduous to be accomplished with no better apparatus than the metaphysics of an undergraduate and the mathematics and arithmetic of an exciseman,"¹ and were disposed "to study the effects of those habits which are communicated by the circumstances of civil life."² His unusual position is that in the eighteenth century, in an age of innovation, he asserted the Aristotelian mood with certain reservations. Along with Aristotle, Burke exhibited a preference for existing institutions, a faith in what had been tried, and a distrust for abstract speculations and metaphysical generalities in political matters.

Of the theoretical attitude to the problem of arranging a state, one of the most interesting statements is that by Aristotle concerning Hippodamus,³ a planner of towns, who also sought to plan states on new lines. We are told that he held interesting political theories. "The state which he planned to construct was one of 10,000 citizens, divided into three classes: the first of artisans, the second of farmers, and the third a defence force equipped with arms. The territory was to be similarly divided into three parts. One was intended for religious purposes; the second for public use; and the third was to be private property. . . . Hippodamus also believed that there should be only three classes of laws, corresponding to the three main issues—wanton assault, damage, and homicide—on which he held that all lawsuits arise."⁴ Aristotle contended that "there is a sad confusion

in the ideas of Hippodamus on all these matters."⁵ The simplicity of the Hippodamian innovations leads to confusion because the ideal lines of mathematics do not form the natural basis of political life.

In regard to another Hippodamian proposal—a law for conferring honors on anyone who should make an invention of benefit to the state—Aristotle argued that "it might encourage false accusations (of revolutionary plans) against the reformers, and perhaps lead, in this way, to political disturbances."⁶ It might furthermore encourage changes which are really subversive of the laws, though proposed on the plea that they tend toward the common good.⁷ Aristotle questioned the wisdom of reformers who would lightly change the laws of a country even though it might be for the better, because the spirit of innovation can be more destructive than the continued existence of the older law.⁸ It is from habit that law derives the validity which secures obedience.

The faults that Aristotle attributed to Hippodamian planning were reflected in Burke's charges against the political philosophers of eighteenth-century France. As Hippodamus divided his city, citizens and laws into three parts, the French builders, "clearing away as mere rubbish whatever they found, and, like their ornamental gardeners, forming everything into an exact level, propose to rest the whole local and general legislature into three bases of three different kinds; one geometrical, one arithmetical, and the third financial; the first of which they call the basis of territory; the second, the basis of popu-

lation; and the third, the basis of contribution." In France, Burke saw politics treated as a problem of geometry, to be worked out on general principles altogether disregarding the traditions and unique circumstances of the nation. "Circumstances," he would say, "give in reality to every political principle its distinguishing color and discriminating effect."¹⁰

Burke criticized the political philosophers of eighteenth-century France for their remoteness from political life. Pure metaphysical abstraction does not belong to politics and no rational man ever governed himself by abstractions.¹¹ In opposition to the French spirit of incautious and experimental legislation, Burke posed the mode of political thought of the Classics. He opposed the kind of politics furnished by political speculators who endeavoured to build up government anew on a logical and symmetrical plan. "The science of constructing a commonwealth, or renovating it, or reforming it, is, like every other experimental science, not to be taught *a priori*. Nor is it a short experience that can instruct us in that practical science. . . . In states there are often some obscure and almost latent causes, things which appear at first view of little moment, on which a very great part of its prosperity or adversity may most essentially depend. The science of government being therefore so practical in itself, and intended for such practical purposes, a matter which requires experience and even more experience than any person can gain in his whole life, however sagacious and observing he may be; it is with infinite caution that any man ought to venture upon pulling down an edifice which has answered in any tolerable degree for ages the com-

mon purposes of society, or on building up again, without saving models and patterns of approved utility before his eyes."¹²

Burke was restating the Aristotelian mood when he said that he abhorred "all operations of opinion, fancy, inclination and will, in the affairs of government, where only a sovereign reason, paramount to all forms of legislation and administration, should dictate."¹³ Along with Aristotle, Burke favored the empirical method of investigating, making sure that the proposed measure was in accord with the legitimate need. He believed in moving cautiously, feeling every inch of the way, and employing much thought, deep reflection, and a sagacious, powerful, and combining mind. "I must see with my own eyes, I must, in a manner, touch with my own hands, not only the fixed, but the momentary circumstances, before I could venture to suggest any political project whatsoever. I must know the power and disposition to accept, to execute, to persevere. I must see all the aids and obstacles. I must see the means of correcting the plan, where corrections would be wanted. I must see the things; I must see the men. Without a concurrence to the design, the very best speculative projects might become not only useless, but mischievous."¹⁴

As Aristotle condemned Hippodamus for conspiring to encourage innovation, Burke criticized the French "who complained of everything," but "refused to reform anything, and they left nothing, no, nothing at all unchanged."¹⁵ He spoke of the French revolution as a revolution of *innovation*. "They conceive, very systematically, that all things which give perpetuity are mischievous; and therefore are at inexpiable war with all establishments. They

think that governments may vary like modes of dress, and with as little ill effect. That there needs no principle of attachment, except a sense of present convenience, to any constitution of the state."¹⁶ Neither Burke nor Aristotle, however, was opposed to reform as such, but only to the spirit of innovation that might result from constant change. Aristotle said that the good statesman "should be able to find remedies for the defects of existing constitutions,"¹⁷ and "must therefore examine not only this but other constitutions, both such as actually exist in well-governed states, and in any theoretical forms which are held in high esteem; that what is good and useful may be brought to light."¹⁸ With Aristotle, Burke allowed the fullest share of importance to the reform of existing institutions, and constantly emphasized that it was his hatred to innovation that produced his plans for reform.¹⁹ Burke drew a distinction between change and reform, pointing out that change "alters the substance of the objects themselves, and gets rid of all their essential good as well as of the accidental evil, annexed to them," while "reform is not a change in the substance or in the primary modification of the object, but a direct application of a remedy to the grievance complained of."²⁰ Burke's opposition to the French was an opposition to change and not to reform. That which Aristotle feared to be the outcome of Hippodamian innovations, Burke saw in the French spirit. The spirit of change has such devastating consequences that one must take every precaution against letting the people think lightly of their own existing political order.

To sum up, the French planners were attacked by Burke for their abstractness. They endeavored to reduce the science

of government to the brief formulae of geometry. Their abstract perfection was their practical defect. Furthermore, they were innovators, not reformers. Burke accused them of changing everything, but reforming nothing. The excellent statesman, in the eyes of Burke, was not the innovator who describes the excellences of some experimental and unattainable utopia, but the man with a disposition to preserve, who "always considers how he shall make the most of the existing materials of his country."²¹ For Burke, as for Aristotle, the principles of good government lay in a marvellous combination of a disposition to preserve and an ability to improve. The spirit that admires concreteness, that finds experience a strong asset to statesmanship, and that fears innovation in politics marks Burke's contribution to political thought.

MORTON J. FRISCH

Pennsylvania State College

NOTES

¹Edmund Burke, "Reflections on the Revolution in France," *The Works of the Right Honorable Edmund Burke* (12 vols.; rev. ed.; Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1865-67), III, 476. Hereafter referred to as *Works*.

²*Ibid.*, pp. 476-7.

³Rex Martienssen, "Greek Cities," *South African Architectural Record* (January, 1941), XXVI, No. 1, pp. 23-4: "Three important cities, planned on a unified scale and dating from the fifth century....(were) Thurii in South Italy (443 B.C.), the Piraeus (479 B.C.) and Rhodes (408 B.C.). The design of these three towns has been attributed to Hippodamus of Miletus who was born about 500 B.C....Hippodamus can be accepted as standing for a universal recognition of the formal and geometric approach to the problems of town-planning. He appears to have been well established in Athens as a protégé of Pericles during the richly constructive years of the fifth century B.C., and whatever justification of the claim to his being founder of the new science of town planning, the illustrious background of

his own city must have stood him in good stead. Athens at this time was widening the range of her commercial activity and the Piraeus underwent a corresponding development as her mercantile port. The opening was an obvious one for a town-planner of overseas repute, and it is not difficult to picture the modernization of the old port on a rational basis as a key political undertaking of Athens."

⁴Aristotle *Politics* ii. 8. 1267b.

^{5,6}*Ibid.*, 1268b.

⁷*Ibid.*, 1269a: "When we reflect that the improvement likely to be effective may be small, and that it is a bad thing to accustom men to abrogate laws light-heartedly, it becomes clear that there are some defects, both in legislation and in government, which had better be left untouched. The benefit of the change will be less than the loss which is likely to result if men fall into the habit of disobeying the government."

⁹Burke, "Reflections on the Revolution in France," *Works*, III, 461.

^{10, 11, 12}*Ibid.*, pp. 240, 310, 312.

¹³Burke, "Letter to a Noble Lord," *Works*, V, 189.

¹⁴Burke, "Letter to a Member of the National Assembly," *Works*, II, 43.

¹⁵Burke, "Letter to a Noble Lord," *Works*, V, 187.

¹⁶Burke, "Reflections on the Revolution in France," *Works*, III, 347-8.

¹⁷Aristotle *Politics* iv. 1. 1289a.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, ii. 2. 1260b.

¹⁹Burke, "Letter to a Noble Lord," *Works*, V, 188.

²⁰*Ibid.*, p. 186.

²¹Burke, "Reflections on the Revolution in France," *Works*, III, 440.

CANE AWARD

The Classical Association of New England has awarded its Scholarship to the Summer Session of the American Academy in Rome for 1953 to Miss Lois-May Waters of Needham, Mass., a teacher of Latin in the Winsor School.

IOWA LATIN WORKSHOP

Theme:

"Old and New Roads to Rome"

June 22-July 11, 1953

Staff

Carolyn C. Bock, University of Minnesota, Duluth Branch

Gerald F. Else, State University of Iowa (Director)

Myra L. Uhlfelder, State University of Iowa

Ralph L. Ward, Yale University

Program

Basic Course: The Latin Language (Else)

Electives:

The Linguistic Approach to Elementary Latin (Uhlfelder)

Classroom Teaching Problems (Bock)

Readings in Colloquial Latin (Ward)

Roman Life (Uhlfelder)

The Age of Caesar and Cicero (Else)

The Latin Curriculum (Bock)

From Latin to Romance (Ward)

Individual Projects (Staff)

Special Events

Panel discussions and audio-visual displays

Visiting speakers will include Waldo E. Sweet, William Penn Charter School, director of the special Latin Workshop at the University of Michigan ("Sweet" method), and Robert G. C. Levens of Merton College, Oxford University.

Homer's Savage Fish

FOR A FEW YEARS in the twenties one of the most assiduously cultivated small gardens in the broad demesne of Homeric studies was the problem of the position of fish in the Homeric diet. In reasonably rapid succession a series of articles on this subject appeared in American journals. But for some mysterious reason the lively question seems to have lost its interest. Its abandonment is the more surprising because no explanation satisfactory to all the disputants was ever brought forward. There were, in fact, as so often happens when anything connected with Homer is under discussion, just about as many explanations as there were disputants.

On the facts as set forth in the Homeric poems there was little argument. Two important points were tolerably well agreed to by all.

1) Homer was obviously familiar with the use of fish as food, and it seems apparent that at least the common people of his own world ate fish and had already devised various means for catching them.¹

2) The heroes of the poems, however, pretty clearly had so low an opinion of fish as food that they would eat it only as a last resort to avoid starvation. The characters of the *Iliad* are never very far from a copious supply of sound normal food, and no character in that poem ever eats fish. The men of the *Odyssey* are less fortunate, but their very misfortunes make the aversion to fish more explicit and clear.² When Menelaus is telling Telemachus how,

while he and his men were becalmed on the island off the Egyptian coast, his men spent their time fishing, he adds, apparently as an explanation, "famine was oppressing their belly" (4,368-9). Equally remarkable, when Odysseus and his men are held by adverse winds on the island of the sun, and after they have exhausted their ship's stores, they live for a time on fish and birds, "from necessity," and we are again told, "famine was oppressing their belly" (12, 329-332). This diet is so distasteful to them, however, that as soon as Odysseus is out of sight one day, the men are instigated by Eurylochus to abandon it in favor of some broiled steaks derived from the cattle of the sun, even though Odysseus has strongly warned them against the dangers of eating these sacred animals. In fact, the slaughter and eating of these cattle is the undoing of Odysseus' men, and they actually lose their lives because of their refusal to put up with a diet of fish for a short time. Greater dietary prejudice than this hath no man.

This curious contradiction between a familiarity with fish as food on the part of the author and the most extreme (and never explained) aversion to it on the part of his characters naturally inspired in antiquity and modern times an effort to find an explanation. The explanations which have been offered, though widely divergent, are practically all reasonably attractive and quite convincing. In fact, I am not sure that any of them is absurd or wildly improbable. And this is a very remarkable thing in

Homeric studies.

An explanation which goes back to antiquity and which has also met with no little approval in modern times (it is approved by Rhys Carpenter, for example, in his recent *Folktale, Fiction, and Saga in the Homeric Epics*³) is that the absence of fish in the Homeric heroes' diet is due solely to artistic considerations. It is more dignified, more heroic, to eat roast beef, pork, kid, and mutton; so Homer was careful to give his heroes a diet proper to their general splendor.⁴ Somewhat like this is the notion that Homer is being careful to avoid in his heroes' diet anything hinting at effete luxury, or dainty culinary trickery. There must be no "Frenchified fuss and made dishes" but "a plain leg of mutton" for these great men of a noble and simple past.⁵

The scholars who dealt with the problem in the twenties, however, were not satisfied with these aesthetic and ethicodidactic explanations. John A. Scott, impressed by the reports of modern travellers, found the reason in the simple fact that the fish in the lakes and streams of Asia Minor is today of singularly low quality and used only by the very poor.⁶ He was later forced to admit, however, that the salt-water fish of the region is good.⁷ A. D. Fraser, who had pointed this out, felt a religious taboo was involved.⁸ Max Radin argued that the attitude towards fish in the Homeric poems seems to have nothing religious about it, pointed to some evidence suggesting that even salt-water fish of respectable quality is rare in the vicinity of Smyrna, and inclined to feel that Scott's idea was probably right.⁹ It was frequently suggested in these discussions that there was a social cleavage in this matter and that the poor ate fish while the aris-

tocrats did not. This still leaves unanswered, of course, the question of why they did not. H. J. Rose tried to answer it along these sociological lines by arguing that Homer's gentry were northerners, perhaps of Nordic stock. Since "Nordics as a rule are no great eaters of fish," the "heroes simply regarded fish as a nasty food, fit only for wretched foreigners" who constituted the lower classes.¹⁰

My own humble connection with this problem owes its origin to an idle hour spent some years ago reading a murder mystery. Doubtless because of the uniquely stimulating effect of stories of this type on the human intellect, I realized at once, when I read one macabre episode in the book, the relevance and importance which it had for Homeric scholarship, and I apologize to all Homerists living and recently dead because I did not at once dash off a note to one of the learned journals. But press of other duties intervened, and by the time I thought of the matter again, I had forgotten both the title and the author of the inspiring story. After all, one does not (at least, I do not) put the names of mystery stories on 3 x 5 cards and file them in the precious archives from which one will, when time permits, extract treasures for future generations. For a time I kept hoping that I should be able to recall this vital bit of bibliographical data and could then present the material to a world trembling to welcome it. When my own efforts to recall the book failed, I resorted to the low artifice of recommending to friends and students titles which had a hopeful sound and asking them to be on the lookout for this episode, but all to no avail. At times lately I have been forced to wonder if I ever did read such a story

after all. Perhaps it was all a dream—perhaps Athena in the guise of Dorothy Sayers appeared to me as I slept and suggested this gruesome scene to me. But—I seem to be falling into the mystery-story technique myself, and postponing the puny climax to the last chapter.

As I remember it the crucial portion of this tale (or dream) ran something like this: The story takes place in an English town on the sea coast. The victim is bashed on the head with a blunt instrument and thrown off a cliff into the sea. The body is not recovered for some days, and when it is finally found, it presents a most unseemly appearance as a result of having been mangled by sea creatures. An impressionable young constable is unable to keep from describing or hinting at this, and there is much horrified talk about it in the town. The talk of the dreadful disfigurement of the corpse comes to the ears of the innkeeper, and he immediately calls his cook in and says, "Better take lobsters off the menu for a few days." In short, because at the moment the village is acutely aware that sea creatures are not so fastidious in their diet as to refuse to eat human flesh, the astute innkeeper sensibly suspects that his customers may not at this juncture be very eager to return the grisly compliment and eat sea food.

Now one of the most peculiar and striking characteristics of Homer's whole treatment of fish in his poems is that this conception of them as eaters of human flesh is so explicit and so frequently repeated. In fact, it plays so large a part in his portrait of fish that it is most strange that the scholars who discussed the problem so vigorously in the twenties were not impressed by it. Actually, none of them so much

as mentions it. Neither does it seem to have made much of an impression on the commentators,¹¹ though they regularly have notes of some kind on the passages which reveal the Homeric heroes' dislike of fish as food. I have been so much influenced by this silence on the part of the learned men who have dealt with the problem, and also, I suppose, so snobbishly conscious of the lowly origin of my own feeling that Homer's insistence on the point that fish eat human flesh might well be highly relevant to his heroes' dislike of eating fish, that I had almost concluded that my feeling was a bizarre whimsey resulting from a poor literary diet. But in 1948 Stanford in the second volume of his fine new edition of the *Odyssey*¹² incidentally and tentatively remarked that this conception of fish as eaters of human flesh might be connected with the heroes' avoidance of fish as food. Now that the idea has attained respectability through being mentioned by the Professor of Greek at Dublin, I am inspired to follow in Stanford's courageous footsteps, and I venture to summarize the Homeric evidence on the subject. It will, I think, be sufficient to lend no little plausibility to Stanford's suggestion.

Stanford's note is on the passage in the *Odyssey* relating that a week after kidnapping the little Eumaeus his treacherous nurse died on the Phoenician traders' ship and her body was thrown overboard to be a "find" for seals and fish (15, 477-480). To this Stanford cites two parallels, one in each poem: In the immediately preceding book of the *Odyssey* Eumaeus, talking about his absent master (who is really before him in the guise of a beggar), expresses the conviction that Odysseus is dead. If he died on land, dogs and

birds have doubtless torn the flesh from his bones; if he died at sea, he has been eaten by fish and his bones lie wrapped in sand (14, 133-6). During the battle at the river in the *Iliad*, Achilles throws the body of Lycaon into the water and cruelly says, "Lie there now with the fish, which at their ease will lick the blood from your wound. Your mother will not place you on a bier and bewail you, but eddying Scamander will carry you into the broad bosom of the sea. And some fish, darting along a wave, will leap up under a black billow and eat the bright fat of Lycaon" (21, 122-7). Besides these instances noted by Stanford, there are two other passages which refer to fish eating dead bodies. A little farther on in the battle at the river Achilles leaves the body of Asteropaeus lying on the sand and partly in the water. "And the eels and the fish busied themselves about him, gnawing and nibbling the fat on his kidneys" (21, 203-4). In the last book of the *Odyssey* Laertes, speaking to the stranger about his son Odysseus, says that his son has probably been eaten by fish on the sea or become a prey for dogs and birds on land (24, 291-2). It seems somewhat odd that this particular activity of fish should be mentioned by Homer so many times. When we recall that fish are named in his poems only eighteen times in all, so that these instances amount to one third of the total, it seems stranger still. (The passage cited above, 21, 122-7, contains two of the eighteen instances.)

Another noteworthy fact is that even apart from these episodes where fish eat human bodies, fish tend to occur in highly grim surroundings with a very curious frequency. In *Od.* 10, 124, Odysseus' men are speared in the water

like fish by the savage Laestrygonians. In 12, 245 ff., when the horrible monster Scylla seizes and devours six of Odysseus' men, she hauls them up to her cave like fish on a line. In 22, 383-9, the corpses of the slaughtered suitors lying in blood and dust in Odysseus' great hall are compared to fish caught in a net and strewn in death on a beach. And in the *Iliad* Patroclus pulls from his chariot a man he has just speared through the head "as a man pulls a fish from the sea" (16, 406-8). These instances plus the ones in which fish eat corpses of men amount to ten in all, or more than one half of all the instances of Homer's use of the word fish. Obviously, to Homer the fish was a singularly unpleasant beast, and well deserved the adjective *omestes* he applied to it in *Il.* 24, 82. Homer connects this savage word only with fish, dogs, birds, and men, all of them creatures avoided as food.

Again, there are in Homer three animals mentioned in connection with the devouring of dead bodies: birds, dogs, and fish. Just as birds and dogs are the scavengers on land, so fish are the scavengers of the sea. Of these three animals fish and birds are eaten only to avoid starvation and dogs are not eaten at all. (The avoidance of the dog does not seem strange to us, because we also do not use it for food; but it would probably seem very strange indeed to natives of some parts of the world where roast dog is, I understand, regarded as a great delicacy.)

This fish problem may, then, be another illustration of the wisdom of Aristarchus' doctrine that one should explain Homer out of Homer himself. When Homer, who really gives very little attention to fish, devotes so surprisingly much of that little to what must be

for man their most unpleasant characteristic, and when in addition he seems in his mind to connect fish with ghastly human death, there may be no need to look further for an explanation of the definite lack of enthusiasm Homer's heroes show for eating fish. At least, this explanation deserves far more serious attention than it has hitherto received, and should certainly be regularly mentioned by scholars and scholiasts as one of the possible reasons for this minor peculiarity of Homer's world.

It might be added by way of postscript that this lugubrious theme of fish eating the bodies of dead men retained its vitality long in Greek literature. There is a short section in the seventh book of the Greek Anthology (273-294) where it is very frequent. The Homeric phrase, "a find for fish," recurs in one poem (273), and another (276) may be taken to show how gruesome the subject can be made if one really exerts one's imagination. See also 286 and 288.

FREDERICK M. COMBELLACK

University of Oregon

NOTES

¹Odyseus' men in *Od.* 4, 369 and 12, 332 use fishhooks. This is significant for some of those who believe that fish eating was actually far more common than Homer lets on. It was argued in antiquity that Odyseus' men could not have procured hooks on the island of Thrinacia and must therefore have carried them as regular equipment. See Athenaeus 1, 13 (Vol. 1, p. 57 in Gulick's Loeb edition). A further suggestion of the importance of fish is in *Od.* 19, 113, where in the description of the prosperity of a good king we are told, "and the sea provides fish." In *Od.* 10, 124 Odyseus' men are speared like fish. (There

are many textual variants here.) *Od.* 12, 251-254 (a simile) refer to the use of a fishing rod. *Od.* 22, 384-386 (a simile) refer to the use of nets. The *Iliad*'s only fisherman (in a simile) draws the fish from the sea "with line and bright bronze" (16, 408). Fishing is also alluded to in *Il.* 24, 80-82 (a simile), where it seems a line is used. Because so many of these references are in similes, this has been cited to support the theory that the similes give us pictures of Homer's own world in contrast to the distant age of the heroes at Troy. See, e.g., the notes by W. B. Stanford, *The Odyssey of Homer*, Vol. 1 (London, 1947), on 4, 293 and 368-369.

²From Scholia A on *Il.* 16, 747 it appears that one argument used by the ancient Separatists to prove that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were not by the same poet was that the author of the *Iliad* never portrays his characters eating fish while the author of the *Odyssey* does. The use or non-use of fish has also, of course, been used by the modern Analysts as a criterion for separating layers in the poems. One reason, for instance, why C. Robert maintained that *Il.* 16, 746-749 must be rejected from the "Uriliad" was that the passage presumes the use of fish as food (*Studien zur Ilias* (Berlin, 1901), p. 103).

³Berkeley, 1946, p. 86.

⁴See the scholia (ABT) on *Il.* 16, 747. Among moderns, in addition to Carpenter, may be mentioned E. Belzner, *Homerische Probleme*, Vol. 1 (Leipzig & Berlin, 1911), pp. 61-62.

⁵See Dioscorides in Muller, *Frag. Hist. Graec.*, Vol. 2, p. 193, and Plutarch, *Moralia*, 668 F.

⁶"Homeric Heroes and Fish," *CJ* 12 (1916-17) 328-330. Cf., too, his note, "The Taboo on Fish in the Worship of the Great Mother," *CJ* 17 (1921-22) 226.

⁷"Homeric Heroes and Fish. Second Note," *CJ* 18 (1922-23) 242-43.

⁸"The Ancient Fish-Taboo," *CW* 15 (1921-22) 164-65 and "The Homeric Fish-Question," *CJ* 18 (1922-23) 240-42.

⁹"Homer and Little Fishes," *CJ* 17 (1921-22) 461-63.

¹⁰"Homer's Little Fishes Again," *CJ* 19 (1923-24) 49-50.

¹¹Merry and Riddell, *Homer's Odyssey I-XII* (Oxford, 1876 (2nd. ed. 1885)), on 3, 368 do go so far as to say that "in the judgment of the Homeric age, 'fish... were often reckoned with the beasts of prey.'"

¹²*The Odyssey of Homer*, Vol. 2 (London, 1948), on 15, 479-480 (p. 260).

NOTES

Contributions to this department in the form of brief objective notes should be sent direct to the editor, Oscar E. Nybakken, State University of Iowa, 124 Schaeffer Hall, Iowa City, Iowa.

A Note on Horace "Odes" 1, 4

THAT I should comment upon Horace's famous ode, *Solvitur acris hiems*. . . , may seem appallingly presumptuous. Surely the meaning is clear! As everyone can readily see, keen winter gives way to lovely spring. Horace paints a nature in bloom, "and then abruptly, as abruptly as it comes in real experience, he strikes the note of death"* in line 13: *pallida Mors aequo pulsat pede*. . . . And so, the ode enjoins us, let us have our pleasures while we may.

I cannot possibly have any major comments upon so obvious a meaning. I have merely minor comments which will, I trust, adjust by a hair's-breadth our perspective of line 13. Minor comments may be of interest when the poem is great, and they temper presumption by modesty.

True enough, winter is *acris* and spring is a welcome change. The theme is immediately clear, but there is however a second theme, one that is inextricably part of the first. I suggest that winter is not solely bitter but also pleasant. The death of winter entails a loss, a loss of comfort enjoyed by nature (*stabulis gaudet pecus*) and by man (*arator igni*). These comforts are set against a brilliant landscape (*prata canis albicant pruinis*).

All this beauty and comfort is lost; a different beauty and a different pleasure will come instead. Nevertheless Cytherean Venus will lead *choros* and not far behind the goddess of love

and of renewed passion is the memory of the betrayed Vulcan.

Loss and gain are held in a delicate balance, one so fine that Horace's point of view is practically nihilistic. That rueful *cliché* "there is good and bad in everything" is felt in the ode with such vividness that choice becomes impossible. No judgments can be made: there is only change. Possibly, as everyone knows, the Sestius referred to was a consul who favored Brutus but accepted honors from Augustus. If this is true, then the core of the poem has a political application as well: one cannot judge politics; rulers come and go. (And pleasures too, with Lycidas, are somewhat indiscriminate.)

To return to the first three stanzas, I find that they are unmistakably concerned with both destructive and creative forces. Death and life are closely associated. All is good; all is bad, and all changes.

And so, thematically, line 13 does not emerge abruptly, for Horace has in part been talking about death all along. The line states what the previous stanzas have hinted.

But the shift from implicit to explicit statement is abrupt and emphasizes the gaunt specter of Death personified. The thirteenth line represents not a change of thought but of feeling.

*Archibald Campbell, *Horace* (London 1924) p. 78.

WILLIAM SYLVESTER
Kansas State College

Inaugural Lectures on the Classics

(This paper was read at the Southern Section of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, at Atlanta, Georgia, November 30, 1951)

SING unto the Lord a new song! for your son has successfully undergone his solemn test in the presence of an immense assemblage of professors and students. He replied without mistake to all the questions asked of him: he shut the mouths of all disputants: no one could bring him to the wall. Furthermore, he gave a banquet that will long be remembered; both rich and poor were invited; it was an unprecedented feast. Finally he has begun his course in such a way as to empty the schools of the other masters, attracting around his chair the mass of the students.¹

THE FATHER'S PRIDE at receiving such a letter as this from his son, newly created Master of Arts at the University of Bologna, must have been somewhat tempered by the inevitable postscript, begging funds to pay the bills for the banquet. The letter is included in Boncompagno's *Complete Letter-writer*, compiled early in the thirteenth century. It may, therefore, represent the ideal rather than the actual consummation of the long labors that secured a Master's degree and the license to teach. I have quoted it not to arouse sympathy for the strain that educating a son imposed on the parental budget seven hundred years ago, but to direct attention to the place of the inaugural lecture in the good old days when even the initiation of a professorial career might bring dignity and renown. The young scholar today rarely has such an opportunity to shine, or such an early and crucial challenge to his abilities as a lecturer. Popular

treatises laid much stress on the importance of preparing for this occasion by careful study and note-taking, independent thought, private tutoring and such occasional practice lectures as a Bachelor of Arts might have opportunity to deliver before the great day of his promotion to the Master's degree arrived.

The inaugural lecture was one of many features of mediaeval education that was incorporated in the schools and universities of the Renaissance. No single occasion in the teacher's later career was likely to be quite as significant as his first official lecture, but even after he was well established the formal oration with which he opened a new academic year might have a decided effect on his scholarly reputation and hence on his income. During the late fifteenth century, when dozens of Italian cities competed for the services of eminent scholars, the inauguration of a newly appointed teacher of Greek and Latin Eloquence, or of Humane Letters, was a major public occasion, for the lectures were commonly addressed not merely to the students who would attend the less spectacular classes throughout the academic year, but to the leading citizens of the town—*virī clarissimi*. Even a scholar who held the same post for some time needed to pay careful attention to the content, form and delivery of his opening lecture each year. He must outline the course of study that he intended to follow, indicate its usefulness for the students, allay any apprehension that parents or the City Fathers might feel about the ethical merits of the

authors to be expounded, and withal so demonstrate his own ability that local students would flock to his courses instead of deserting him for some new-comer, and that more might come from other towns, and even from other countries, to throng his lecture-room. In that happy event, he could count on a renewal of his contract, probably with a larger public stipend in addition to the increased income from student fees, if indeed another city did not make him an even better offer. It was well to have an impressive lecture in readiness.

Fewer of these inaugural addresses are extant than one might expect, considering how many were delivered. Manuscript commentaries on classical authors more commonly begin with a brief factual introduction on the author's life, the purpose and contents of his work, and other conventional items in the preliminary accessus. A teacher would be less likely to record his introductory lecture in the same notebook in which he entered the materials for his running commentary on a text, since he would need to vary it from year to year. When students took notes on their master's exposition of an author, for their own later use, they generally seem to have omitted the *praelectio*, or opening lecture—perhaps it was not considered good form to take notes on that state occasion, and it may also have been physically difficult to do so, since mere students would be crowded in behind more illustrious members of the audience. But it is more probable that they realized they must depend on their own invention and ingenuity for their future inaugural lectures, when plagiarism, otherwise considered as a prudent virtue rather than a vice, would be an obvious sign of incompetence. In printed commentaries the dedication to

a noble patron usually takes the place of an introductory lecture, which, after all, was planned for delivery to a specific audience, and not for the more general purposes of a printed edition. On the other hand, we sometimes find inaugural lectures preserved without the commentaries that they originally served to introduce, in editions of their author's works, or in his manuscript notebooks, or in collections of Renaissance orations by different scholars.

These inaugural addresses have their own value for the history of classical scholarship, supplementing that of the commentaries. In the latter, as in the lectures on which many of them are based, an author's work was studied and annotated line by line, word by word, to help students construe and comprehend the text and identify historical and mythological allusions, to extend their knowledge of grammar, rhetoric, and sometimes natural science and philosophy as well, and not least to increase their command of classical Latin and Greek vocabulary. This piecemeal dissection of a text, which one of my former teachers used to call "picking and botanizing," was very useful for students, and especially for those who intended to teach, but the introductory lecture offered much more scope for display of scholarly virtuosity. Here the teacher could present grandiloquent generalizations that would inspire and illuminate the more pedestrian labors to follow.

I have chosen four examples to illustrate various types of the inaugural *praelectio*. The first is an address on Juvenal, delivered at Bologna by Filippo Beroaldo the Elder. Beroaldo was something of a prodigy; he began to lecture on rhetoric, eloquence and poetry at

Bologna in 1472 at the ripe age of nineteen. A contemporary tells us that his charming presentation of unusual material attracted many admiring students. After some years at Parma, Milan and Paris, he returned to Bologna, and it was probably at this time that he delivered this lecture on Juvenal.²

Most noble gentlemen, I constantly find myself marvelling at the stupidity of certain of our contemporaries, and censuring their foolish and unmanly lamentations—I mean the kind of men who are forever belittling their own times and exclaiming, *O tempora! O mores!* They complain, bewail and cry out to heaven that it is only at the present time that the world rushes headlong to destruction, that poisoners, parricides, cut-throats, brigands, cheats and tricksters win honor and wealth, that the country is full of wickedness and vice. Now if these men had only taken the trouble to study the ancient records of Romans and barbarians, if they had any accurate knowledge of past history, if they had really read the poets, and especially the satirists, they could not fail to realize that there were as many crimes and as many criminals in those early days as there are now. They would know that our ancestors had ample reason to bewail the very evils against which they themselves cry out today. Why else did the ancient Romans ratify so many laws, issue so many senatorial decrees, and pass so many plebiscites, save in an attempt to curb the shocking evils and the evil men that had multiplied so rapidly? As a disease must be diagnosed before a cure can be found, so also crimes must have arisen before laws were framed to repress and punish them.

Beroaldo supported this unconventional but logical interpretation of Roman history by well-chosen quotations from Seneca, the *Trinummus* of Plautus, and Sallust, before he continued:

Most worthy gentlemen, I am convinced that it was this wellspring of iniquity and vice that begat, ennobled, and instructed the satirists, who as public censors most severely castigate trickery, rapine, indecency,

adultery and six hundred similar evils, and, armed with biting wit, most bitterly attack them. With enough, and more than enough, ammunition for their warfare on corruption, they serve the human race no less than those self-styled philosophers do who go about with dirty clothes, unkempt beards, censorious brows and wrinkled foreheads and filthy mops of hair, eloquently and endlessly denouncing other men's misdeeds, though they themselves are proverbially "steeped in sin, harbingers of gloom abroad, and dissolute at home." But the writers of satire, in my opinion, are the true philosophers. They disclose and censure the secret sins and foul deeds of women and men alike, and thus recall us to decency. They strive to make bad men good and good men better. Finally, by their censorious verses they really achieve what the books and maxims of the philosophers merely preach, for they make us live uprightly, spurn evil ways and adopt good ones, shun vice and embrace virtue. They lead us to practice frugality, to limit luxury, to restrain our greed, to respect honest poverty, to cherish continence and probity. Hence I firmly believe that we should not merely read the satirists but memorize them; we should never let a day pass without taking them up. No one has any right to criticize their occasional use of biting and even licentious words. This license is necessary when you are attacking indecency, and such words are, after all, Latin. (Here Beroaldo quoted Cicero's *Philippics* to give the stamp of purest Latinity to abusive language)... These shocking words serve to attack shocking deeds, not to commend them. Why indeed should good men be ashamed to write frankly what wicked men do not hesitate to do openly?

Beroaldo then gave his version of Plato's scheme for using nursery rhymes for the moral instruction of infants. He concluded that memorizing the satires of Persius, Juvenal and Horace was as essential for the modern boy's education as learning the odes of the prophets had been for Hebrew youths. A peculiar merit of the Latin satirists, he claimed, was that they confined their personal

attacks to the dead, and thus avoided the slanderous character of Greek satire. This reversal of the familiar precept, *De mortuis nil nisi bonum*, is commonly found in comments on the end of the first satire of Juvenal.

Having thus established the educational value of the satirists in terms well calculated to refute contemporary arguments that their language made them unfit for young students, he gave his reasons for lecturing on Juvenal rather than the others.

Though all three should be read, loved, and thoroughly studied, Juvenal is ranked highest by learned men, as the most terse and elegant, whom Acron does not hesitate to prefer to Lucretius, Persius and Horace. For he is unsurpassed in his attacks on vice, and in censorship of morals he has an elegant and charming style. He shows marvellous erudition, satiric freedom and acerbity; his readers are refreshed by the learned variety of his satires, seasoned with so much salt and so much beauty. He is, in a word, consistently sublime, always enlightening. He presents in exquisite style the customs and interests of his own time, with historical examples and much recondite information. He is the juiciest of poets (*boni succi plenissimus*—a phrase difficult to translate, in view of the modern implications of the word "sap") and the most worthy of interpretation. Hence I feel entirely justified in choosing this poet for my public lectures, especially since he has been, alas, rather polluted than illuminated by the commentaries of certain learned men. For my part, to the limits of my ability, I shall undertake to explain every detail, so that every problem may be solved, every knotty point untied, every obscurity cleared up. And since in literary studies some further progress is always possible, I am not afraid to promise that I shall solve some points hitherto left untouched and obscure.

I beg and beseech you to weigh with honest balance and unbiased judgement what others have said of Juvenal with what I shall say. I would be the last to deny that those who wish a really complete and

absolute understanding of the classics will find something still to desire. It will be sufficient for me, however, if I satisfy your needs. The gods grant that none of you may ever repent having put yourselves under my instruction.

How far Beroaldo succeeded in fulfilling his promises we cannot judge. His published works include annotated editions of various authors, but there is no indication that he ever prepared his commentary on Juvenal for publication, and all that I have been able to find of it is four notes on individual lines that are included in his miscellaneous *Adnotationes*³ and were occasionally cited by other commentators. His reputation for critical scholarship fell far short of his popularity as a teacher. One contemporary said of him: "Beroaldo ebbe buon bottega, e mal disposta." Perhaps it is as well that we cannot compare his exposition of Juvenal with the prospectus given in his introductory lecture.

My second example is also a lecture on Juvenal, delivered at Padua at about the same date as Beroaldo's, by an unidentified scholar, to an audience apparently composed of members of religious orders, whom he addressed as *domini et fratres*.⁴ The lecturer's method and style are very different from Beroaldo's, as one would expect, and his lecture is notable for its citation of mediaeval authors as well as the usual classical and patristic authorities.

If our predecessors had failed to express their knowledge in words, Latinity would have been forever lost. Whatever we know, we have either heard from others or discovered for ourselves. Whoever has any useful knowledge, if he does not make haste to impart it to others, incurs the brand of slothfulness. That is the reason, my reverend lords and brothers, why I have decided to yield to the persuasion of certain devoted friends and read and expound to this large

audience the pithy ideas (*succosam sententiam*) of the satirist Juvenal, with which I have gained some degree of familiarity through long and painstaking study. First, however, following the example of my illustrious predecessors, I wish to present to your charitable ears a brief sermon on our present life, with due respect to the words of Paul to the Colossians: "Whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ." Note also the words that Boethius quotes, in Book III of *The Consolations of Philosophy*, near the end of the ninth prose passage, from the *Timaeus* of Plato: "In even the most trivial matters it is fitting to pray for divine guidance."

The invocation that follows consists of original verses, mediaeval in form, but Vergilian in tone, calling on the gods to guide his little boat over the waves, and a paraphrase of Valerius Maximus' preface, with the invocation to *Dea Roma* from Lucan's *Pharsalia* (1.195-200)—altogether a very pagan introduction to a sermon. Unfortunately, at this point the manuscript becomes illegible, but one can make out that after speaking of the moral values of Juvenal's attacks on vice and his exhortations to virtue, he cited as the text of his discourse another passage from Boethius, which he repeats several times thereafter: *Aversamini vicia et colite virtutes*. To illustrate this text he cited Augustine and then gave a wide range of mythological examples of the penalties for egregious wickedness, with special reference to avarice. Prosper, Galfridus' *Poetria*, the *Ars Poetica* of Horace, Petrus Riga's *Aurora*, Aristotle, Valerius Maximus, Lucan, Seneca's tragedies, Ovid and Juvenal himself are all quoted to support the text. The final page of the lecture is missing, so we cannot tell how the *sermunculus* ended, or how he contrived the *descensio ad litteram*, the transition from this sermon to the text of the pagan *auctor ethicus*.

My final illustrations are preserved in the writer's own notebooks, the *Collectanea* of Giambattista Cantalicio, a versatile and prolific poet, lecturer, and hanger-on at the courts of Urbino, Rome and Naples, whose varied activities never won him the security for which he hoped, and whose copious commentary on Juvenal's *Satires* is preserved, so far as I have been able to discover, in only one manuscript.⁵ Several contemporary poets, however, wrote verses in praise of his interpretations of the text. Juvenal seems to have been the author to whom he devoted most attention, but I have not found any trace of his *praelectio* on this author. His notebooks include several of his introductory lectures, such as that on Horace and Valerius Maximus, which he evidently used more than once, in his wandering scholar's life, for the version preserved in his own handwriting is addressed at some points to the citizens of Perugia, and at others to those of Spoleto. One hopes that he did not offend either audience by failure to correct his script before delivering the speech. He was the type of clever and quarrelsome scholar who could get appointments more easily than he could keep them. One of his longer sojourns was at Foligno, where the local records show that the City Fathers valued his services so highly that they even fined the wool-workers for disturbing his classes. When he suddenly departed from the city in 1484, leaving the school without a master, since his creditors and personal enemies had become too much for him to cope with, his pupils made life very difficult for the presumably steadier but less brilliant pedagogue who took his place. Strangely enough, he ended his stormy career as a bishop.

He began his lecture on Horace and

Valerius Maximus by citing the Delphic maxim, *Cognosce te ipsum*, with a graceful apology for his own shortcomings as teacher of grammar, poetics and oratory at so notable a center of learning as Perugia. He cited a long list of ancient authorities on the various arts and sciences, contrasting them with his own lesser knowledge, and thus, with apparent modesty, suggested the wide range of his learning. Turning to his immediate topic, he praised the art of poetry:

This art draws on every field of learning, and by invention of fables teaches and delights us, though some foolish men would actually bar the poets from their list of wise men on the ground that they sing nothing rational, but only fables. The ancients were wiser, who considered poetry the earliest philosophy, as it teaches us sound standards of conduct and of personal aims, and in a truly delightful fashion molds our judgement.

Later generations, too, he said, have ascribed wisdom primarily to the poets: "For the virtue of a poet is that of a good man also; we cannot conceive of a poet who is not first a good man." (This definition would seem to restrict the list of poets considerably.) He then summarized the history and value of poetry, describing Orpheus as the first theologian, and opposing to those who objected to the citation of poets in theological works Varro's definition of theology as threefold, so that it readily admits the testimony of poets about the manifold purposes of God, and his infinite power, under the superficial mask of polytheism. He also defended the pagan poets for the allegorical value of their works:

For there is no poetic fable that is not allegorically true. The Gospels are full of poetic metaphors, and poetry, as the Church

Fathers show, is a recognized vehicle for theology, philosophy, law and all good and holy customs. Poetry preceded and gave rise to prose, and is thus the appropriate introductory study for children. The first historians and physicists chose poetic fables to express their ideas, and the fictitious elements in poetry do not obscure its essential truth, but add to its beauty and popular appeal. The art of poetry is the surest guide to the other arts.

After another appeal to the goodwill of the worthy citizens of Perugia (or Spoleto) for their consideration and aid in the year's work, he announced his program of lectures for the term:

I intend to interpret to you this year, most eminent young men, first Horatius Flaccus, whose lyric poems we shall study, with God's help—a work, as God is my witness, drawn from Greek sources and most salutary for mankind, if it be rightly understood. After that, we shall continue with his other works, which have great moral significance. In the second course of lectures we shall take up the most religious and delightful history of Valerius Maximus, and shall read and interpret various other works, with the utmost diligence and precision, choosing them in accordance with the intellectual standards of your school. But now let us return to Flaccus, whose life, following the long-established custom of the schools, is the first topic for our consideration. Here you have it, in verses of my own composition....

After the versified life of the poet—had he chosen this form to display his own gifts of versification, or to provide his pupils with information in terms they could easily memorize?—Cantaliccio considered the other conventional introductory topics, stating the poet's purpose in these words: "to win himself immortal glory by his imitation of the Greeks, and to contribute to the general welfare of the human race; how well he achieved this end, his own works bear witness." In conclusion, Cantaliccio

tactfully recited ten lines of verse by a contemporary Perugian poet, Francesco Matarazza, who was himself a recognized authority on Latin metres and on Cicero's *Philippics*. One wonders whether he also found a local bard to quote when he gave the address at Spoleto.

When, in later years, he returned to his native town of Cantalice in the Abruzzi as public professor, he announced a more comprehensive program, a sort of Great Books course. He had published a useful treatise on grammar and metric, the only one of his works, aside from his poems, that achieved the distinction of printed editions, and despite his checkered career, could claim no less than seventy former pupils who were teaching in various cities. Cantalice was a smaller center than others at which he had taught, and he evidently thought that its students would appreciate a broad rather than an intensive course of study. After a summary of his earlier career, he outlined the coming year's work as follows:

Perhaps, my most erudite auditors, you may ask what authors I intend to discuss in this first year with you. By God's help, and with good fortune, we can interpret all the Latin poets and prose authors, and all the monuments of the grammarians. I have decided to begin with Maro, Cicero, Ovid and Suetonius Tranquillus. Thereafter, if the gods favor us, we shall turn to other writers, but our chief attention will be devoted to the entire works and precepts of the grammarians, which we shall discuss, dictate, teach, and expound till nothing is left unstudied. However, I have not yet quite made up my mind which of Cicero's works we are to consider. But we shall certainly discourse with the greatest precision on Maro's divine *Aeneid* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. We shall also discuss Suetonius Tranquillus' history of the twelve emperors, than which nothing could be more elegant and useful....

This was evidently a portion of the course which he felt it necessary to sell to his audience, for he paused to quote Cicero's definition of history, and to give a brief summary of Roman chronology, before he concluded:

Now, most noble men, I shall end this feeble preface, and according to your expectations, begin the teacher's province you have allotted me, and so arrive at the beginning of my lectures in your city. I have spoken.

EVA MATTHEWS SANFORD

Sweet Briar College

NOTES

¹Quoted in A. Luchaire, *Social France at the Time of Philip Augustus*, tr. E. B. Krehbiel (New York, 1929) p. 93.

²The text of this lecture is edited by Karl Mullner, *Reden und Briefe italienischer Humanisten* (Vienna, 1899), pp. 60-63, from MS Riccardianus 914.

³*Adnotationes centum in varios auctores*, in Janus Grober, *Thesaurus criticus* (Frankfort, 1602) I 195-310; the comments on Juvenal are also given in Badius Ascensius, *Adnotationes doctorum virorum* (Paris, 1511), pp. 63v-64v, and in an edition of Juvenal published at Milan in 1514.

⁴Preserved in MS Vaticanus lat. 1718, s. xv, prefixed to a text of Juvenal with occasional interlinear and marginal glosses.

⁵MS Laurentianus lat. 90 sup. 24. Cantalicio's commentary on Juvenal, composed for his lectures at Perugia in 1488, is preserved in his autograph manuscript, Vaticanus Urbinas lat. 662, which he presented to Guido of Urbino in 1492. His marginal notes on Juvenal in MS Vaticanus lat. 7716 are chiefly drawn from the lectures of Martino Filetico, though he did not acknowledge their source. On Cantalicio's life, see B. Croce, "Sulla Vita e le Opere di Cantalicio," *Archivio Storico per le Provincie Napoletane*, 49 (1924), 155-191; D. A. Messini, "Il Cantalicio Maestro di Scuola di Foligno," *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana*, 115 (1940), 15-38; G. Zannoni, "Il Cantalicio alla Corte di Urbino," *Rendiconti dei Lincei*, 5.3 (1895), 485-507.

C. A. N. E.

At its meeting in Deerfield, Mass. March 20-21, the following officers were elected by the Classical Association of New England:

President, Miss Josephine P. Bree, Albertus Magnus College, New Haven, Conn.

Vice-President, Prof. F. Warren Wright, Smith College

Secretary-Treasurer, Prof. Claude W. Barlow, Clark University

Additional Members of the Executive Committee:

1951-1954 Miss Mildred I. Goudy, Crosby High School, Waterbury, Conn.
1952-1954 Miss Jane W. Perkins, Brookline High School, Brookline, Mass.

1953-1955 Prof. Robert E. Lane, University of Vermont. Miss Margaret Frances Phelan, Rogers High School Newport, R.I.

Representative on the Council of the of the American Classical League: Prof. Claude W. Barlow, Clark University

Editor for New England of the CLASSICAL JOURNAL: Prof. James A. Notopoulos, Trinity College

Next year's meeting will be held at Bowdoin College, April 2-3, 1954.

LATIN INSTITUTE

The College of William and Mary

THE FIFTEENTH session of the Institute on the Teaching of Latin at the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Virginia will be conducted this summer from June 22 to July 11. Instruction will be carried on as heretofore by Professors A. P. Wagener and

George J. Ryan of the Faculty of the College, assisted by Miss Gertrude J. Oppelt, Chairman of Foreign Language Department in the South Side High School of Fort Wayne, Indiana. Professor Henry T. Rowell of Johns Hopkins University will be present during the second week of the Institute to deliver a series of lectures on literary and archaeological topics. The work will be devoted, as in previous summers, to practical problems of Latin teaching in the high school. The success of such a program has been attested by the enthusiastic endorsement of teachers who have attended. Included specifically are the review and analysis of curricular procedures, materials, and methods; techniques of instruction and classroom management in connection with a demonstration class from the local high school taught by Miss Oppelt; and daily practice in the reading and oral use of Latin. In the afternoon workshop there will be supervised work upon the selection and organization of Latin and English material; the preparation of units of work, study plans, drill exercises, and tests; development of activities; and the preparation and use of audio-visual aids. The work done by each student will be planned on the basis of individual needs and interests. For successful completion of the program of the Institute credit of four semester hours will be given by the College. During the week-ends opportunity will be afforded to become acquainted with the restored area of Colonial Williamsburg and to visit Jamestown, Yorktown, Richmond, the colonial estates along the James River, and the Virginia beaches. A special bulletin may be secured by writing to Dr. A. P. Wagener, Director of the Institute.

During the fourteen sessions of the Institute, three hundred and sixty-four teachers of Latin from thirty-seven states, the District of Columbia, and Canada have been in attendance. States represented last summer included Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, North Carolina, Ohio, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia.

In addition to the Institute, courses in Elementary Greek and Greek Civilization and Its Legacy will be given during the regular nine weeks summer session of the College which opens on June 16.

BOOK REVIEWS

Athenaion Politeia: The Constitution of the Athenians. By the Old Oligarch and by Aristotle. Translated by LIVIO CATULLO STECCHINI. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1950. Pp. 112. \$2.50.

THESE TRANSLATIONS are intended primarily for students in the History of Western Civilization course in the College of the University of Chicago. Presumably, these students cannot read Greek, but Stecchini is indebted to them "for raising questions, formulating problems, and suggesting solution." The second purpose of this book is "to make the documents accessible to the general reader and to provide him with the end result of recent scholarly criticism." Finally, "the footnotes have been in the main limited to the purpose of justifying my own interpretations to the scholar." In other words, this little book will meet the needs of the undergraduate, the general reader, and the scholar. What an accomplishment within 112 pages!

The reader will learn many things, including the following: the so-called "Old Oligarch" was Thucydides, son of Melesias; he composed this work in the second half of 431 B.C.; the essay "has the literary form of an oration" but it "is organized according to the form of medical treatises." It is easy to prove these and other matters: start with mere possibility, then call it probability, and later, fact. Sometimes a simple *ego dixi* is enough to establish proof. I have no quarrel with jumping in general; the ancient and venerable Salii practiced it with the acclaim of all. But jumping at conclusions is not to be tolerated under any circumstances. Stecchini should come down to earth. He has set himself up as a great god on high Olympus, casting his pearls of wisdom down before the rest of us ignorant, academic swine, and awaiting our display of gratitude and admiration.

"Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth." Matthew V, 5. By this standard, Stecchini is left portionless.

ALFRED P. DORJAHN

Northwestern University

Roman Anniversary Issues: An Exploratory Study of the Numismatic and Medalllic Commemoration of Anniversary Years, 49 B.C. to A.D. 375. By MICHAEL GRANT. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1950. Pp. xxiv, 204; 2 plates. \$4.50.

READERS OF this *Journal* have been introduced to the general topic of Grant's book by West's fascinating article "Imperial Publicity on Coins of the Roman Emperors" (*CJ* 45 (1949) 19-26). While West called our attention to the propaganda on Roman coins for contemporary events, and mentioned only in passing the coins commemorating the 900th and 1000th anniversaries of the Foundation of Rome (24, 26), Grant confines himself exclusively to commemorative issues. Yet, to his subject, too, applies West's pithy remark: "One may find an excellent analogy between such use of coins and the similar modern use of postage stamps." Grant himself will present a more popular account of "Roman Coins as Propaganda" in one of the next issues (5/2) of *Archaeology*, and he has already published (in *La Parola del Passato* 18 (1951) 219-213) a supplement to his book under the title "'Timed' Roman Foundations."

Grant's book has been critically reviewed by professional numismatists (most severely by M. Volkmann, *Gnomon* 23 (1951) 322-4), and it is unlikely that many non-numismatists will study or even read it. Yet, this highly specialized book treats of a subject which is of general interest. For, as Grant rightly observed, it is only from inscriptions and coins that we learn of the official policy of the Roman Emperors, especially of their pious concern for the Roman Tradition. Many emperors to whom the historians, ancient and modern, were unkind tried to appear as good Romans and as good Emperors in their inscriptions and on their coins.

There is a noticeable difference between the later emperors and those of the first century (including the Flavians) who commemorated primarily anniversaries of the

new empire, and especially of its founder Augustus. Augustus himself seems to have been preoccupied with his own position and his own anniversaries; Alföldi has just called our attention (*Museum Helveticum* 8 (1951) 190-215) to Augustus as the 'New Romulus.' Beginning with Antoninus Pius, 300th, 500th, and even 700th anniversaries are frequently commemorated on coins. Grant, who combined the discussion of the earlier, dynastic and the later, historical anniversaries, has contributed so much to the reader's confusion that he added a useful 'Summary of the Anniversary issues' which is chronologically arranged by events commemorated rather than by commemorating emperors.

Grant considers seriously the difficulty of understanding and interpreting some of the issues on the part both of the modern student and of the ancient Roman who saw and used the coins. He should also have considered that the imperial mint must have had an extensive coin collection in order to go back to issues 50, 100, or more years old. *Time Magazine* reported (Dec. 10, 1951) on a recent exhibition in Madrid showing "2,000 years of coin-and medal-making." After reading Grant's book, one must think that there was a *Cabinet des Médailles* in ancient Rome.

'Coincidence' is one of the more frequently occurring words in Grant's book, and this is not entirely caused by the admittedly "exploratory" and preliminary nature of his study. Grant never claims that coins were publicly issued in order to commemorate something; this is different with private issues and medallions the discussion of which Grant unfortunately combined with that of the 'real' money. Grant insists, however, that when coins were issued, the issuing agencies frequently used the reverse to commemorate anniversaries which just happened to take place at about that time. Since the long and glorious history of Rome offered anniversaries for almost every year, Grant has many dates to choose from; the critics have pointed out that some of his interpretations, if not wrong, are far fetched. This is especially true in those cases in which the anniversary character of an issue is determined solely on chronological grounds without support of the coin

picture and legend themselves.

Michael Grant is one of the most prolific, energetic, and ingenious numismatists of our time, and his interests go far beyond specialized studies. It may well be that his new book is going to be remembered as the first of a series of investigations which will contribute greatly to our knowledge of Roman Imperial History. This is precisely the claim which Grant himself makes for his work.

A. E. RAUBITSCHKE

Princeton University

Classics in Translation. Edited by PAUL MAC KENDRICK and HERBERT M. HOWE. Vol. I: *Greek Literature*; Vol. II: *Latin Literature*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1952. Pp. xiv, 426; xii, 436. Each vol. \$5.00; both vols. \$9.00.

IT IS A WELL KNOWN fact that the maker of a chrestomathy pleases nobody, including himself. Perhaps that is the reason why books of this sort usually are gotten out under joint editorship; the criticism and censure can be shared, and, therefore, borne more easily. I shall not quibble about the selections: *quot homines, tot sententiae*.

The essay on Greek culture, by Walter Agard, and the companion-piece by Paul Mac Kendrick, will be enlightening to student-reader and interested layman alike. The absence of a glossary will be felt keenly at times by the uninitiated reader, but the insertion of helpful notes will alleviate the difficulty. The end-sheet maps are carefully designed and beautifully executed.

The distinctive feature of these two volumes is the fact that the translations are new and in contemporary English. According to the Preface, the purpose of the modern idiom is to "meet the student where he is." Well, I find the following in volume I: ceryl-bird (p. 95), Dike (p. 95), ambient (p. 96), anthrysc (p. 96), melilots (p. 96), pancratium (p. 99), pancratiast (p. 100), helichrys (p. 101), snood (p. 101), cairn (p. 102); in volume II: leveret (p. 215), skimrack (p. 215), hirondelle (p. 215), crepitating (p. 215). Also, I find that "Sir" has been modernized by the substitution of

"Sire" in Pliny's letters to Trajan. Although the gentle reader is warned that the selections from Catullus are imitations, not translations, it is nevertheless disconcerting to find the Roman poet praising the "printing press" (p. 205) for getting out the first edition of his poems.

These two anthologies will serve as an introduction to Greek and Latin literature as well as any similar volumes have served in the past or are now serving. In my opinion, however, Longman and Green's *Greek and Roman Classics in Translation*, edited by Murphy, Guinagh, and Oates, at \$6.00, is a better "buy" than is the present two volume edition at \$9.00.

ALFRED P. DORJAHN

Northwestern University

The Greeks and the Irrational. By E. R. DODDS. (*Sather Classical Lectures*, 25.) Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1951. Pp. ix, 327. \$5.00.

THE CONCERN of our age for the irrational element in man and the development by psychology of a *novum organum* to deal with it have made it inevitable that a classical scholar of our time should give us a systematic study of the irrational and the Greeks. The irrationality of the Greeks in the terms of Freud and Jung is not the theme of this book, and the general reader who may be eager to see modern psychiatry explain everything irrational will be definitely disappointed. It is not that kind of book and Professor Dodds did not intend it as such. It is a systematic review of almost all the facts and opinions held on the subject, deepened and enlarged by a scholar of real vision and width of experience, and revealing carefully weighed judgment on the most controversial questions. It is fortunate that the Regius Professor of Greek at Oxford has the vision to see the problem in clear perspective and has the scholarship requisite for its complicated issues. In his edition of Proclus' *Elements of Theology* he showed that he was an expert in Greek Neoplatonism; and in his edition of Euripides' *Bacchae*, in his articles on Maenadism, on the irrational elements in the spectrum of Euripides and of Plato he showed equal

competence in dealing with the irrational in the Greeks of the Classical period. In addition to all this, Dodd's wide readings in comparative anthropology, psychology, and religion can assure the reader that his horizon will be enlarged by a study of this volume.

This book asks the right questions and seeks to answer them with imaginative integrity. So far our interpretation of the genius of Greece has mainly stressed the rational, with which the Greeks are naturally associated in the history of thought. The Pre-Socratics, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle have permanently set their impress on us as to the supreme position of *logos* in man. Because the Greeks are human beings they partake of the irrational; but like sin we have been habituated to be "agin it" or to treat it as a transient accoutrement of leaden mortality which classical scholarship has refined away, as best it can, in its evaluation of Greek genius. We have become victims of Platonic hypotaxis and suppressed the irrational with the result that, as in the story on page 1 of the young man who was simply not moved by the Parthenon sculptures in the British Museum because they were "so terribly rational," the Greeks seem alien to modern man. He feels a sort of remote, cold admiration for rational perfection, which like Heaven is there but not very accessible in our troubled world. If the Greeks are to influence our generation they must be sympathetically shown to be mortal in their immortality; their irrationalism must be set in a *men* and *de* antithesis with rationalism, as is true in our own lives. When this happens as it does in this book, then we shall feel a truer kinship with the Greeks, who, like their actors on the stage, can move us by the pathos which irrationalism suffuses in the pattern of life.

In appraising the significance of Dodds' contribution, which consists in seeing the Greeks as compounded—as truly all human beings are—of reason and unreason, we may use an analogy from mathematics, namely a point which has both an *x*- and a *y*-coordinate for a definition of its locus. To understand the Greeks we must define their life on the *x*-axis of reason and at the same time on the *y*-axis of irrationalism. The

value of this book is that it systematically studies and defines the y -coordinate along with the x -coordinate. Sometimes in the life of the Greeks the y -coordinate is high and the x is at 0, as in the earlier phases of Greek life, though mythical thinking may discount this. But as the story of Greek culture unfolds we have the point located on both coordinates. The analysis of rationalism in its relation to irrationalism is made not only with great precision and sane judgment, with accurate stratigraphy in the complex layers of Greek thought, but also with a fresh approach. It is a book which Janus-like faces the past and the future; it ventures into the fields of social anthropology and psychology for judicious illumination of the subject, and Dodds' statement in the preface is quotable: "If the truth is beyond our grasp, the errors of to-morrow are still to be preferred to the errors of yesterday; for error in the sciences is only another name for the progressive approximation to truth" (p. ix).

The arrangement of the text and the notes is dictated by the oral presentation of these lectures. The text profits in clarity of expression by virtue of its lecture presentation, a reminder that the audience, as in ancient oral presentation of literature, can contribute much to the genesis of what we call classic simplicity. This clarity is especially seen in the contrast in style between the main text and Appendix II, a reprint from *JRS*. The notes which follow each chapter are *doctis, Iuppiter, et laboriosis*. The reader will find the notes a post-graduate education in themselves, for they open suggestive trails in fields tangent to the understanding of our Greek texts.

A brief summary of the chapters in the book will show what *tropheia* lie in store for us. Chapter One, "Agamemnon's Apology" (ll. 19.86 ff. and 137 ff.), illustrates William James' dictum quoted at the beginning: "The recesses of feeling, the darker, blinder strata of character, are the only places in the world in which we catch real fact in the making" (p.1). The chapter is a penetrating study of Homeric *ate*, with which Zeus blinded Agamemnon and took away his understanding. *Ate* is the psychic intervention of the irrational in life in no way involving discernible moral guilt, ex-

cept in one passage (ll. 9.512). The various aspects of psychic intervention, the agents of *ate*, which operates through Zeus, Moira, and the Erinys, are carefully analyzed and semasiological differences noted, some of them running counter to our traditional interpretations, which interpolate fantastic anachronisms in Homeric words. For example, the Erinys is not the spirit of vengeance but a spirit invoked by the living to assure them of their *moira*, which is at first morally neutral. The Homeric man's belief in psychic intervention of various forms leads to some important consequences. Among these are the following: 1) the machinery of divine intervention grew out of awareness of psychic intervention; 2) the poets dramatized *menos embale thumo* by theophany, thus shaping the personalities of the gods and thus preventing a lapse into magical types of religion which characterized the Orient. The chapter concludes with the important role which *ate* plays in the Homeric society, whose ideal of *time* resulted in what anthropologists call a "shame-culture," i.e., one where there is tension when a warrior is not able to live up to the high code of honor. *Ate* for him becomes a convenient escape, for he projects his own failure on this psychic agency.

Chapter Two describes the transition from a shame-culture to a guilt-culture, wherein *ate*, by reason of a growing sense of guilt, is transformed into an agency of punishment, with Erinyes becoming the ministers of Justice, and Zeus developing from an amoral god into cosmic justice. The period in which this change occurs is the Archaic Age, which in the realm of the spirit extends as late as the first half of the Fifth Century. We witness in this period the moralization of *phthonos*, which is not a factor in a shame-culture, and man's projection into religion of his own sense of justice, which rises out of his social relations. Moralized *ate* is analyzed with respect to its various phases, such as *daemon*, *moira*, and *phthonos*; and Dodds delineates with skill the complicated spiritual crosscurrents of the Archaic Age, whose insecure conditions led not only to a high sense of shame but also to an escape from pollution in purification.

Chapter Three is an illustration of Socrates' statement that "our greatest blessings come to us by way of madness" (Plato, *Phaedrus* 244 A). This chapter deals with three of the four types in Plato's classification of divine madness—prophetic madness (inspired by Apollo), ritual madness (Dionysus), and poetic madness (Muses)—and attempts to relate them to the basis of belief in them, the impact of advancing rationalism upon them and the identification of these states with those recognized by modern psychology and anthropology. Though no exhaustive treatment is given of each of these states Dodds' remarks about each of them are valuable for their sound insights. The account of Dionysiac madness is excellent, as was to be expected from Dodds' previous work. The setting of these states within the framework of modern psychology should be of interest to every teacher who must deal with these phenomena in humanities courses as well as to amateur or to professional psychologists.

Chapter Four, entitled "Dream-Pattern and Culture-Pattern," deals with the attitude of the Greeks toward dream-experience in which the individual escapes from time and space. Here Dodds steers clear of the Freudian and Jungian universal dream-symbols and analyzes the relevant passages to dreams in Homer; the "divine dream" or *chrematismos*, which is a culture-pattern in the religious experience of the people which the poets adapted to literary uses; and the techniques of incubation employed to provoke this divine dream. Medical incubation at Epidaurus is discussed and Dodds interprets the Epidaurian Temple Record as a genuinely religious experience. The genesis of this document is related to the culture-pattern types of dreams, which depend "on a socially transmitted pattern of belief, and cease to occur when that belief ceases to be entertained" (pp. 103-104). Hesiod's account of the Muses speaking to him on Helicon is interpreted as a real experience expressed in literary terms, and Philippiades' vision of Pan before Marathon is validated, as other examples show, in the context of the psychological influence of solitude. The study of the dream in primitive society enables Dodds to find the root of the Greek dream-

experience in the realities of the irrational. The remainder of the chapter deals with the fate of Greek dream-experience in the hands of Greek intellectuals, such as Heraclitus, Xenophanes, the author of the Hippocratic treatise *On Regimen*, Plato, and, above all, Aristotle, all of whom approach dreams from a scientific rather than the religious point of view, the latter of which is revived by the Stoics and discussed by Cicero in his *De Divinatione*. (Reference here should have been made to Pease's edition of this treatise, which has so many references to the literature on occult phenomena.)

Chapter Five, "The Greek Shamans and the Origin of Puritanism," is the most original contribution in the book and important for its new light on the history of fifth-century irrationalism. Certain manifestations of the irrational in Greek life, such as described in Pindar's fragment (131 Schroeder) and the *soma-sema* doctrine, are set in the background of shamanism, which has left its traces in a huge arc extending from Scandinavia as far as Indonesia, with its culture still surviving in Siberia. Rhode pointed out that the notion that the soul is a prisoner of the body, that the soul is an occult self of divine origin and at odds with the body is not a Greek doctrine. Following a suggestion of the Swiss scholar Meuli, who showed that the Greeks came into contact with peoples in Scythia and Thrace who were influenced by shamanistic culture, Dodds more boldly declares that the fifth-century conception of the *psyche*, as seen in Socrates' doctrine of the soul, is part and parcel of this vast movement of shamanism involving an experience in which a psychically unstable person, after a religious retreat "emerges with the power, real or assumed, of passing at will into a state of mental dissociation" (p. 140). As an archaeologist picks up trails of migration in designs of sherds so Dodds finds certain trails in the evidence that lead to shamanism, such as the reference to Aristeas, who at the bidding of Apollo went north and returned to tell of strange experiences that may have been modelled on the psychic excursions of northern shamans. An examination of the evidence concerning Hermotimus, Epimenides, Pythagoras, Zal-

moxis, Empedocles, and Orpheus shows shamanistic psychic phenomena involving the detachment of the soul from the body by certain techniques. Shamanism, underlying all these experiences, came from the North into Greece via Scythia, crossing the Hellespont into Asiatic Greece, and after a possible combining with remnants of Minoan tradition in Crete, extending to the Far West with Pythagoras and Empedocles. This interesting chapter ends with a discussion of reincarnation, which Nilsson takes to be the product of Greek logic. Dodds seeks an explanation for it as a more satisfactory solution than post-mortem punishment to the problem of divine justice which was born in the Archaic Period. It is to be associated with the deep-seated feelings of guilt and the growth of Greek puritanism in the form of *catharsis*, *askesis* in the Orphic and Pythagorean traditions. The ancients, like the moderns, had their doctrine of Original Sin, which though transmitted physically was capable of transcending the guilt feeling via reincarnation, a doctrine suggested to the Greeks by contact with shamanistic beliefs and practices.

Chapter Six, entitled "Rationalism and Reaction in the Classical Age," illustrates Whitehead's dictum that "the major advances in civilization are processes which all but wreck the societies in which they occur" (p. 179). The Fifth Century inherited from the Archaic Period a deposit of successive movements which Gilbert Murray has called "the Inherited Conglomerate." The rationalism of Athens initiated by the Pre-Socratics and developed by the Sophists vigorously attacked this "Inherited Conglomerate," whose confusion Aeschylus attempted to master through moral sense. The attack on mythical thinking by Hecataeus, Xenophanes, Heracleitus, Anaxagoras, and Democritus was carried on by the Sophists and by Euripides. Though this is a commonplace chapter in our histories of Greek thought, it receives fresh treatment here in its relation to the irrational. As a result of the onslaught of reason, the daemonic world of the irrational has withdrawn, leaving man alone with passions which Euripides portrayed in masterly fashion. We find in Athens a divorce between the intellectuals

and the people; the intellectuals withdraw into their world and the people, bereft of spiritual guidance, withdraw into a world of pleasure and regress into the primitive past with strong revivals of incubation and magic. Part of the reaction takes the form of prosecutions of intellectuals and of the revival of orgiastic religions, such as we witness in the *Bacchae* of Euripides, and of other forms of similar worship which suddenly appear in Athens at the end of the Peloponnesian War which foreshadow the Graeco-Roman world.

The Seventh Chapter, "Plato, the Irrational Soul, and the Inherited Conglomerate," depicts Plato's attempt to stabilize the situation in the tense picture which we find in Athens at the end of the Fifth Century. In trying to understand Plato's counterreformation Dodds suggests that we must ask two questions: 1) what importance did Plato himself attach to the non-rational factors in human behavior; and 2) what concessions was he willing to make to irrationalists? Like his ancestor Solon, called in to conciliate a material conflict over two centuries before, Plato attempts a compromise. Though himself a product of the age of Enlightenment, Plato has some affinities, through his visit to the Pythagoreans in West Greece about 390, with the magico-religious ideas of northern shamanistic culture. Plato achieves his compromise in the new conception of the soul where the divine detachable occult self, which is the carrier of guilt feelings, is identified with the Socratic rational *psyche*; and in this new union, which changes the old shamanistic culture-pattern, we find room for reincarnation, which remains unchanged while the shamanistic trance is transformed into the detachment of the rational soul from sense-experience. The shaman's occult knowledge acquired in a trance becomes now metaphysical vision while the shaman's recollection of earthly lives becomes now a recollection of bodiless Forms. In the context of this transformation Dodds presents a startling and original interpretation of the much criticized Guardians of the *Republic*, who are now interpreted "as a new kind of rationalized shamans who, like their primitive predecessors, are prepared for their high office

by a special kind of discipline designed to modify the whole psychic structure; like them, must submit to a dedication that largely cuts them off from the normal satisfactions of humanity; like them, must renew their contact with the deep sources of wisdom by periodic 'retreats'; and like them, will be rewarded after death by receiving a peculiar status in the spirit world" (p. 210). Further evidence of Plato's conciliation is to be seen in his awareness of the importance of the affective elements, such as Eros, and the consideration of passion as a source either of sensualism or of intellectual activity. The chapter concludes with Plato's proposals, as outlined in the *Laws*, for reforming and stabilizing the "Inherited Conglomerate."

The final chapter, "The Fear of Freedom," surveys selectively some highlights of the problem of Greek irrationalism in the succeeding eight centuries, until the last pagan Neoplatonists. As Dodds surveys the perspective we see unfolding the high peak of the development of rationalism in the Fourth Century through the transformation by science of isolated observation into a system of methodical disciplines, in a world which transcended the confines of the city-state and expanded it into a cosmopolitan culture. At the supreme moment of rationalism's triumph Aristotle realized the necessity of studying the irrational factors which play so great a role in behavior. His study of the psychology of the irrational was unfortunately not continued after the first generation of his students. The succeeding philosophers of the Hellenistic Age went back to the naive intellectualism of the Fifth Century, with a fantastic psychology which suppressed the "irrational soul" for two centuries. The resurgence of rationalism among the Stoics, with the consequent decay of tradition, set men free to seek their own new gods; and here we see illustrated T. H. Huxley's remark at the beginning of this chapter, "A man's worst difficulties begin when he is able to do as he likes" (p. 236). The lonely free individual now formed small private clubs such as "Apolloniasts" and "Iobacchi," devoted to the worship of individual gods.

The *vis inertiae* which keeps things going prevented the complete triumph of ra-

tionalism, and the Inherited Conglomerate survived until the advent of Christianity. Reason now, far from triumphant, enters a slow intellectual decline which, despite some rear-guard actions, lasted down to the capture of Constantinople, the reasons for which decline baffle the historian. Irrationalism gained the day in the form of pseudo-science as manifested in astrology and occultism. This amalgam of science and religion awaits clarification with the forthcoming publications of Nilsson, Nock, and Festugière.

The book closes with an important question: what caused the failure of Greek rationalism? Dodds offers a suggestion for this complicated problem which has had many attempted answers, which are pithily enumerated. Here it is worth while quoting Dodds directly: "Behind the acceptance of astral determinism there lay, among other things, the fear of freedom—the unconscious flight from the heavy burden of individual choice which an open society lays upon its members" (p. 252). The refusal of the individual in an open society to assume responsibility commensurate with his freedom led to hardening of philosophic speculation, to quasi-religious dogma, finally to superstitious obsessions like amulets which show the triumph of the irrational.

At this point Dodds leaves us with the confession that in writing the last chapter he hears the bell tolling for our generation as well. "We too," he says, "have witnessed the slow disintegration of an inherited conglomerate, starting among the educated class but now affecting the masses almost everywhere, yet still very far from complete. We too have experienced a great age of rationalism, marked by scientific advances beyond anything that earlier times had thought possible, and confronting mankind with the prospect of a society more open than any it has ever known. And in the last forty years we have also experienced something else—the unmistakable symptoms of a recoil from that prospect. It would appear that, in the words used recently by Andre Malraux, 'Western civilization has begun to doubt its own credentials'" (p. 254).

In this complex matter Dodds admits that "a simple professor of Greek is in no posi-

tion to offer an opinion" (p. 254) as to the recoil before the jump; but, if history is any guide, he does offer, on the basis of Greek experience with reason and the irrational, the suggestion that it was not the rider but the horse, the symbol of the irrational elements in human nature, which refused to jump. The history of this problem in Greece shows that the earlier Greek rationalism, before the Hellenistic Age, was aware of the irrational and made efforts through the only instrument open to it, mythology and symbolism, to deal with it. Modern man, however, with the development of greater instruments to deal with the irrational, should be able to understand this horse, so that the "rider will one day take that decisive jump, and take it successfully" (p. 255). This last chapter illustrates how Greek studies, if undertaken with the understanding and breadth of outlook shown in this book, can be of great help in understanding our own problems, which, because we are so immersed in them, we lack the requisite objectivity and the perspective to analyze. Dodds has performed a great service in supplying us with this perspective in one of the eternal problems of man. Greek scholarship, like Calchas in Homer, can relate the present, the future, and the past as part of its work.

The book contains a bonus for us in the form of two Appendices. The first reprints, with a few additions and corrections, the first part of Dodds' valuable article on "Maenadism in the *Bacchae*," published in *HTHR* 33 (1940); and Appendix II contains, with a few changes, his article on "Theurgy and Its Relationship to Neoplatonism," published in *JRS* 37 (1947). The index is good because it includes references to the history of ideas, but it could have been more useful if it systematically indexed the details which one is not likely to find by glancing through the work, namely those in the notes. A few such details, however, are indexed though one is not able to fathom the criterion by which they are included.

Dodds displays in this book such stature of scholarship that a reviewer cannot indulge in the usual carping as to faulty details. Issue may be taken on still controversial points, on whether *ate* involves guilt in Homer, as *Il.* 9. 512 indicates; on

the precise meaning of abstract words and concepts in certain periods; on the distinction between shamanism and possession, such as is found in the Pythia; on the irrationalism in Euripides and in Plato. The reviewer, however, shall confine himself to what seems to him to be most questionable in this book, namely, the setting of so much of the evidence of Greek irrationalism in the framework of shamanism. Whether this is going to be one of the truths or errors of tomorrow depends not so much on the evidence as on the interpretation of the evidence. It is true that many phenomena in Greek irrationalism have much in common with shamanism. Is this similarity by analogy or derivation? Dodds sees much in Greek religion and philosophy as derivation from Northern shamanism, arising out of contacts of the Greeks with the North. There are sherds in our evidence that indicate such a route, as Meuli and Dodds have pointed out. Anthropology, however, offers another possible explanation of this kinship. Parallelism is a well-known phenomenon in anthropology and religion, where similar practices and beliefs can exist in societies between which no demonstrable contact can be shown. Myths of origin among people over the whole world attest to this phenomenon. The reviewer suggests that the question of Greek shamanism be assessed from the standpoint of this parallelism, which characterizes so much of Indo-European peoples in language and in religion. James Gaul's important thesis, which put into the discard the Northern myth in the question of racial migrations into Greece, should give us caution in positing so much Northern influence in Greece, even though this alleged shamanistic influence is later. If such be the interpretation of shamanism in Greece, Dodd's evidence will still be valuable for parallelism, if not for his theory of its origins.

The concept of evolution has largely influenced the historians of thought. This book also is written within the frame of this reference. With respect to the primitive layers of Greek thought as found in Homer can we assume always such evolutionary stages as Dodds presents, for example, in the history of *ate*, which he inter-

pretends as having no original connection with sin? The notion of *ate* as punishment he takes to be a late Ionian development or a later importation from outside: "The only place in Homer where it is explicitly asserted is the unique *Litai* passage in *Iliad* 9, which suggests that it may possibly be a mainland idea, taken over along with the Meleager story from an epic composed in the mother country" (p. 6). Instead of assuming this explanation why not jettison the evolutionary development of this concept? Why could we not have a *men-de* situation here as we find in so much later Greek thought? "The solution from the text" makes this a more natural interpretation. It may be that the realization of the *men-de* status of Greek ideas, with differential development later, will better fit the Greek evidence than the evolutionary approach in books on the history of Greek ideas.

This book, like Rhode's *Psyche*, Nock's *Conversion*, and Nilsson's *History of Greek Religion*, will take its place as one of the seminal books of the classical scholarship of our time. It is a valuable study in the history of ideas; it is well-written and calculated to refresh one's spiritual outlook by an awareness of the relevance of the Greek experience in the conflict of the rational *versus* the irrational. It is a corrective to the rather one-sided picture of Greek rationalism and a repository of the material, theories, and fresh treatment of the material with which a classical scholar deals in his own thinking and teaching.

JAMES A. NOTOPOULOS

Trinity College, Hartford

everybody has agreed to think and to call it so. And the word *illiterate*, in its common acceptation, means a man who is ignorant of those two languages."

Two centuries later there is little of the cultural uniformity and social solidarity which this pronouncement implied. By Chesterfield's definition, we are a world of *illiterates*. But C. Day Lewis, whose poetical translation of *The Aeneid of Virgil* was commissioned for broadcasting on the Third Programme of the B. B. C., is patently not an *illiterate*. For the past twenty years he has ranked among our most distinguished poets. For the past twelve he has been widely known as a competent classicist. And, since he was for many years a public school master before he became Professor of Poetry at Oxford, he knows at first hand the decline of classical learning. In Chesterfield's time the reader of a translation might be expected to have the original in mind as he read. There can be no such expectation today. Therefore it is more important than ever that there be such a good translation of the *Aeneid*. It is important, too, that there is a new poetical translation appearing at all, for seventy-five years have elapsed since William Morris gave us a Victorian interpretation. Day Lewis speaks in the modern idiom, and his interpretation reflects a modern sensibility.

Day Lewis's qualifications as translator are not those of a Conington, a Nettleship or a Conway, but they are still admirable. At Wadham College, Oxford, he studied under C. M. Bowra, and for many years he has been an intimate of W. F. Jackson Knight, Reader in Classics at the University College, Exeter, whose *Roman Vergil* (1944) reveals him to be one of the most creative living interpreters of Virgil. Jackson Knight, Day Lewis tells us in his Foreword to *The Aeneid*, went over the translation with him line by line, and it is to him that the work is dedicated. Further evidence that Day Lewis did not approach the Roman epic as a complete amateur is to be found in *The Georgics of Virgil*, a poetical translation which Day Lewis first published in 1940. This earlier translation is important for several reasons: it gave him experience in line-for-line translation, it led him to select a rhythm, based on the Latin hexameter, containing six beats to a line, and it gave

The Aeneid of Virgil. Translated by C. DAY LEWIS. New York: Oxford University Press, 1952. Pp. x, 288. \$3.75.

IN 1748 IT WAS possible for the Earl of Chesterfield to write, "Classical knowledge, that is, Greek and Latin, is absolutely necessary for everybody; because

him practice in achieving a diction neither flashily colloquial nor perfunctorily grandiloquent. Day Lewis was thus able to take up Virgil's *magnum opus* with considerable knowledge of Virgil and a tested poetical style for rendering him in English.

In consequence, his translation ranks with the best in English. He is by no means as distinguished a poet as Dryden, but he is a good deal closer to his original, in meaning, in tone, in diction, in rhythm. He is as good a modern poet as Morris was a Victorian one, and his version is likely to convince his contemporaries, at least, as more faithful. He may not achieve the literalness of Mackail, but Mackail wrote in prose. He is no better Latinist than the American poet, Rolfe Humphries, whose translation appeared in 1951, but he is more impressive in diction and style.

Day Lewis's translation is almost as literal as Mackail's, and it is remarkably accurate if we consider that it is a line-for-line translation. Surely Day Lewis, of all translators, most nearly captures the Virgilian quality of condensation. Morris, who has done the only other good line-for-line version, is a good deal more copious with his iambic heptameters, and Dryden requires three lines for every two of Virgil's. Though he does not compass all the Virgilian voices, Day Lewis comes as close as anyone to conveying the essential ones. He cannot rival Dryden in passages calling for elevated rhetoric, but he can with Virgil on his middle level, in narrative of action. Here, for example, is his account of how Pyrrhus killed Priam (II, 550-553):

Even as he spoke, he dragged the old
man, trembling,
And sliding in the pool of his son's
blood, right to the altar;
Twined Priam's hair in his left hand,
raised with his right the flashing
Sword, and sank it up to the hilt be-
tween his ribs.

And he comes much closer than Dryden to echoing Virgil's intimate note, to expressing, in Tennyson's phrase, "sadness at the doubtful doom of human kind."

Day Lewis is largely successful with Virgilian styles because he responds sympathetically to Virgil's contrived simplicity of diction. If we do not find, to quote Tenny-

son again, "all the chosen coin of fancy/ flashing out from many a golden phrase," we do discover many lines which recall their originals' luster. Take the elegiac "*Sunt lacrimae rerum, et mentem mortalium tangunt.*" Dryden simply avoids it, writing instead, "And Trojan griefs the Tyrian's pity claim." Morris sentimentalizes in archaisms: "Lo here are tears for piteous things that touch men's hearts anigh." Day Lewis conveys both Virgil's feeling and something of his *curiosa felicitas* as he speaks of "Tears in the nature of things, hearts touched by human transience."

His handling of Virgilian rhythms is not so impressive. Given the challenge of a line-for-line rendition, his metrical problem was not simple. Obviously he could not contain the hexameter in heroic couplets or blank verse, as the more leisurely Dryden and Humphries had done. Taking advantage of the modern acclimatization to stress-meter, reintroduced by Hopkins and strongly supported by Day Lewis himself in *A Hope for Poetry* (1934), he adopted a six beat line which permitted him to protract a line to as many as seventeen syllables and contract it to twelve. A meter as flexible as this, Day Lewis tells us in his Foreword, allows for greater variety of pace and inflection, lessens the temptation to pad or omit, and is consonant with a style based on modern speech rhythms. Yet Day Lewis often creates a new difficulty in place of those he has obviated, by the frequent indefiniteness of his stresses. Were one fortunate enough to have heard the B.B.C. reader, doubtless a definitive reading would be clear. But most readers cannot rely on an oral guide, and therefore may occasionally feel that a sort of nervous twitch has been substituted for "the stateliest measure ever moulded by the lips of man."

Yet if one concedes that Day Lewis has not been altogether successful with the problem of rhythm and that he cannot rival the phrasing of his original, he must at the same time recognize that here is a genuinely poetical translation of Virgil's substance and tone, a translation which the century's illiterates should deeply appreciate.

JAMES K. ROBINSON

Department of English
Northwestern University

f fancy/
phrase,"
h recall
elegiac
mortalis
writing
Tyrian's
izes in
piteous
h." Day
ling and
s as he
f things,
e."
s is not
age of a
problem
ould not
uplets or
y Dryden
dvantage
o stress-
strongly
a *A Hope*
six beat
ct a line
bles and
flexible
his Fore-
pace and
o pad or
le based
ay Lewis
place of
quent in-
one for-
e B.B.C.
ing would
t rely on
occasion-
witch has
measure
Lewis has
with the
cannot rival
ust at the
genuinely
substance
century's
ate.

BINSON

ncy/
se,"
call
giac
alia
ting
n's
in
ous
Day
and
he
ags,

not
f a
lem
not
or
den
age
ess-
gly
ope
eat
line
and
ible
pre-
and
or
sed
wis
of
in-
for-
C.
uld
on
on-
as
ure

has
the
val
the
ely
nce
y's

ALA
ARL
COL
FLO
GEO
ILL
IND
IOW
KAN
KEN
LOU
MIC
MIN
MISS
MISS
NEB
NEB
NEB
OHIO
ONT
ONT
SOU
SOU
TEX
TEX
UTA
VIR
VIR
WES
WIS
WYO
ONT

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE MIDDLE WEST AND SOUTH

OFFICERS FOR 1953-1954

President

William E. Gwatkin, Jr.
University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri

First Vice-President

Lucy A. Whitsel
Marshall College, Huntington, West Va.

Secretary-Treasurer

John N. Hough
University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado

Vice-Presidents for the States and Ontario

ALABAMA
ARKANSAS
COLORADO
FLORIDA
GEORGIA
ILLINOIS
INDIANA
IOWA
KANSAS
KENTUCKY
LOUISIANA
MICHIGAN
MINNESOTA
MISSISSIPPI
MISSOURI
NEBRASKA
NEW MEXICO
NORTH CAROLINA
OHIO
OKLAHOMA
SOUTH CAROLINA
SOUTH DAKOTA
TENNESSEE
TEXAS
UTAH
VIRGINIA
WEST VIRGINIA
WISCONSIN
WYOMING
ONTARIO, CANADA

H. R. Butts
Bertie Johnston
Karl K. Hulley
Gladys Laird
M. Kathryn Glick
Ellen Machin
Ann Dale Kek
Oscar E. Nybakken
L. R. Lind
J. W. D. Skiles
Graydon W. Regenos
Mrs. Emilie J. Stern
B. H. Narveson
A. P. Hamilton
Ruth F. Joedicke
Mrs. Ruth Forbes
Madalene Hendricks
Marie B. Denneen
Adele Knight
Mary R. Bell
Donnis Martin
Grace L. Beede
Isabelle Moser
J. D. Sadler
Marion Van Pelt
Gertrude Malz
Lucy Whitsel
Esther Weightman
Ruby McBride
Emily McInnes

Birmingham-Southern College
Little Rock Senior High School
University of Colorado, Boulder
University of Florida, Gainesville
Agnes Scott College, Decatur
Senior High School, Alton
Indiana Central College, Indianapolis
University of Iowa, Iowa City
University of Kansas, Lawrence
University of Kentucky, Lexington
Tulane University, New Orleans
Mackenzie High School, Detroit
St. Olaf College, Northfield
Millsaps College, Jackson
Mary Institute, Clayton
Omaha North High School
Albuquerque Senior High School
Woman's College, U. of N.C., Greensboro
Willoughby
Oklahoma College for Women, Chickasha
Winthrop College, Rock Hill
University of South Dakota, Vermillion
University of Tennessee, Knoxville
Texas Technological College, Lubbock
946 E. 17th St. S., Salt Lake City
Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar
Marshall College, Huntington
Wisconsin High School, Madison
Natrona County High School, Casper
Cornwall Collegiate Institute, Cornwall

Executive Committee

William E. Gwatkin, Jr.

Lucy A. Whitsel

John N. Hough

W. L. Carr

University of Kentucky, Lexington

Russell M. Geer
Tulane University, New Orleans

James E. Dunlap
University of Michigan

H. Lloyd Stow
Vanderbilt University, Nashville

Ortha L. Wilner
State Teachers College, Milwaukee

Latin Week Chairman

Donnis Martin
Winthrop College, Rock Hill, S.C.

Representatives to the American Classical League

M. Kathryn Glick
Agnes Scott College

Jeannette Munce
Bloomington High School, Illinois

John N. Hough

Officers of the Southern Section

President

Gladys Laird
P.K. Younge Laboratory School
University of Florida

Vice-President

J.W.D. Skiles
University of Kentucky

Secretary-Treasurer

Arthur F. Stocker
University of Virginia

Member of Executive Committee

Donnis Martin
Winthrop College

Delegate to the Southern Humanities Conference

Arthur H. Moser
University of Tennessee

a complete four-year program

CARR-HADZSITS—The Living Language

A Latin Book for Beginners

With Comprehensive Tests, Mastery Tests, Teacher's Manual and Key

CARR-HADZSITS-WEDECK—The Living Language

A Second Latin Book

With Teacher's Manual and Key

WEDECK—Third Year Latin

Also a Text Edition

CARR-WEDECK—Latin Poetry

Virgil's Aeneid, Books I-VI, and Selections from Ovid, Horace, and others

Also a Text Edition

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

Sales Offices: New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Atlanta, Dallas Home Office: Boston

ry
e

Boston